

TODAY'S SPEECH

Speech Association of the Eastern States

In this Issue

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE SAES By Magdalene Kramer	page 1
"THE PUBLIC SPEAKING REVIEW" By Giles Wilkinson Gray	page 5
BROADCASTING, 32-YEAR OLD GARGANTUA By Robert Haakenson	page 8
TEACHING SPEECH IN MILITARY BASES By Merrill G. Christophersen	page 10
TWO VIEWS OF PROPAGANDA By Ross Scanlan	page 13
PROPAGANDA AND PUBLIC ADDRESS By Henry C. Youngerman	page 15
EDUCATION THROUGH GROUP DISCUSSION By James M. Lewis	page 18
THE FIRST DEMOCRAT By Frank Merritt	page 20
<hr/> DEPARTMENTS <hr/>	
TRENDS IN SPEECH By Carroll C. Arnold	page 24
SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH By David C. Phillips	page 28
TODAY'S SPEECH BOOKS By Arthur Eisenstadt	page 31



Today's Speech

A Publication of the Eastern States Speech Association

Volume I, Number 1

April, 1953

DR. ROBERT T. OLIVER, EDITOR
The Pennsylvania State College
State College, Pennsylvania

TRENDS IN SPEECH
DR. CARROLL C. ARNOLD
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

DR. JAMES H. HENNING, PRESIDENT
University of West Virginia
Morgantown, West Virginia

SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH
DR. DAVID C. PHILLIPS
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

DR. GORDON HOSTETTLER, EXEC.-SEC.
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

TODAY'S SPEECH BOOKS
PROF. ARTHUR EISENSTADT
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

ACROSS THE TYPEWRITER

When we begin to publish a magazine devoted to Speech we find ourselves looking anew at some of the old controversies regarding communication. Here we are, not staring across the orchestra pit at an audience, but looking through print at some imagined readers or some distant author (whose ear may be attuned to discover whether there may be echoes from his typed words).

Departmental bi-section of communication becomes increasingly academic when we confront the living pages of our own magazine. The words we might choose to speak are, perforce, written. The analysis of audience takes on a different cast. Our thinking swings into focus on such questions as: should we try to write as we speak? Can we say some things in print that might be harder to express orally? Are we limited in print by the lack of the rich meanings of inflection, emphasis, pause, gesture? Can we who deal in speech address one another in print without abandoning whatever special virtues our speech-centeredness may have developed?

The task of editing brings still another question. To secure a reasonable similarity of form, with a minimum of editing, contributors are urged to write to the Treasurer, Modern Language Association of America, 100 Washington Square East, New York City, to request the **MLA Style Sheet**, a valuable 32-page booklet sold for only 10c. This we shall try to make our guide.

In selecting articles for publication, we shall try to emphasize practicality — never forgetting that a sound and clear analysis of historic factors is often the best guide to today's problems. We are eager to have articles from all manner of people who have something to say that will be helpful in all areas and for all levels of speech skill. In philosophy we shall try not to be so much eclectic as impartial. We hope to be frightened neither by new ideas nor by old traditions. Our aim is that every issue of **Today's Speech** may make every reader say, "This is for me!" With your help as writers, with your reactions as readers, with your guidance as colleagues this is an aim we should be able at least to approach.

History of The Speech Association of The Eastern States

By Magdalene Kramer

When Mr. Huber asked me to discuss the history of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference I was confident that the needed materials for such a history were in the archives of the organization. It was shocking to open the files and find therein no program dated earlier than 1929. I did find bills which indicated that dinners in former years were cheaper than they are now and a few letters by professors who were dunned by their universities for amounts due the treasurer to "pay the bill, please."

Finding little material in the files with which to build a history, I wrote to some of the men who, I thought, had knowledge of the early days of the Association. The replies were clever, but at first not too revealing. To the question, "How many people attended the first conference?" one reply was, "You tell." To a question concerning the magazine published by the Association, one person advised: "Get a copy of the first issue and use your imagination, dear lady." Two individuals stated that they had sets of the magazines; however, one had given his set to the Archives of the Speech Association of America, and the other was open for a bid. "Yes, I have a set. They are in storage. What am I bid for them?" One of the gentlemen to whom I wrote answered as follows: "Sure the history should be written, but the Archives must be lousy." With this latter statement I heartily agree. This document is, because of necessity, a masterpiece as a representation of historical method. For no statement are there two independent sources of information. In fact, there are conflicting reports of some incidents.

All the ideas which I shall express and which could not be gleaned from the programs must be accredited to one of the following: Professors James A. Winans, John H. Frizzell, John Dolman, Alexander Drummond. (Wherever there is a clever turn of phrase, it is to be accredited to one of these gentlemen.) For the 1922 program, I am indebted to Professor Wayland A. Parrish.

Before the establishment of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference there were organizations of elocutionists. However, there was no Association of Teachers of Speech. Sometime before 1910 a young instructor at Cornell University occupied an office with a Professor of Economics, who was editor of "The Economic

Bulletin." This young man heard about the professional meetings of the Economists and other groups and thought, "Why don't the teachers of Public Speaking have meetings?" Whenever he wrote to someone who was teaching Speech, he suggested this idea. He states that he had little thought of what they would confer about, but still everybody else was doing it, so why shouldn't they? The instructor, according to his own statements, was not an organizer, so he did nothing. Neither did anyone else. Finally he wrote to a young teacher at Swarthmore College who immediately responded favorably to the idea and suggested that if the man from Cornell was ever in Philadelphia they get together and talk about it. The young man from Cornell finally went to Philadelphia and the two met in the Broad Street Station, the birthplace of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference.

The first young man, of course, was Professor James A. Winans. The second young man was Paul Pearson. He had been very active in Chautauqua circuits and launched a magazine called "Talent" which was devoted primarily to the interests of professionals of the Lyceum and Chautauqua platform. He organized the Swarthmore Chautauqua and "has the distinct honor of having lost a million dollars in a business venture." He was later Governor of the Virgin Islands, and probably would be best known at the present time as the father of Drew Pearson and Leon Pearson.

Professor Winans says that he has often been referred to as the "founder" of the organization, but he insists that he was not; if he had been he would be tempted to leave directions in his will to have the fact carved on his tombstone.

Professor Pearson planned the first conference which was held at Swarthmore in 1910. Printed invitations were sent out. The title of the Association was "The Public Speaking Conference of the New England and the North Atlantic States." According to rumor, Mr. Pearson selected the name without consulting New Englanders who, in turn, were peeved and gave the conference the cold shoulder. The charter members of the organization were: Dan Redmond, C. C. N. Y.; Frederick B. Robinson, C. C. N. Y.; Erasmus Palmer, C. C. N. Y.; Vanda Kerst, Pennsylvania College for Women; Wilbur Jones

Kay, Washington and Jefferson College; Henry Smith (or Henry Smith Williams), Princeton University; Chambers, Bucknell University (or Franklin and Marshall); John Henry Frizzell, Pennsylvania State College; Frederick Child, University of Pennsylvania; Professor McWhord, teacher of music somewhere—maybe Swarthmore; and Paul M. Pearson.

Most of the individuals attending the first conference were members of departments of English. Very few had the phrase "public speaking" in their professional titles. Three men from the College of the City of New York were exceptions inasmuch as their Department of Public Speaking had been established in 1903 or 1904.

The first meeting was a conference in every sense of the word. It lasted for two days. Although the atmosphere was predominantly elocutionary, it was "a sort of dying gasp for the elocutionists who looked down their noses at mere public speaking folks." It was nevertheless considered to be a real success.

Other early members were Professor Wetzel of Yale University; Bromley Smith of Bucknell; J. T. Marshman of Pennsylvania State College; James A. Winans of Cornell University; Hicks of Swarthmore College; Miss Everett of West Chester; King of Bryn Mawr; George Pierce Baker of Harvard University; and Azubah J. Latham, Teachers College, Columbia University.

The first President was Paul Pearson; the second, Erasmus Palmer; and the third, James A. Winans. Other early Presidents were Dan Redmond, Wilbur Jones Kay, John Hudson, and Everett Hunt.

Women have been with the Association from the beginning. Professor Winans remembers the second meeting, held in the tower room of C. C. N. Y. where Azubah J. Latham of Vermont poked fun at the argumentative speech makers. The Association was limited to college teachers. The attendance of Walter Reeves from Peddie Institute was endured for several years. He started attending in 1916, and was permitted to have a place on the program, but it was not until 1920 that the Association opened its doors to secondary school teachers. Apparently this was a bone of contention in the early days.

The purpose of the organization was to get together and to confer. General meetings were held, and then the group divided for sectional meetings. Each one told what he was doing at

his college. No "learned" papers were given. There was just a friendly and hopeful exchange of experiences and views.

One of the early members wrote that during the 1913 meeting Professor Winters of Harvard electrified everyone by inviting the group to come to Harvard in 1914. The group jumped at the chance. As President in 1914, Professor Winans planned to have the conference at Harvard. But when Professor Winters got home he began to worry about his sudden invitation, and wrote Professor Winans that he feared they would not have a successful meeting at Harvard. So the conference met in New York instead.

At one time there was a Constitution, but somebody lost it, and for years the organization got along very well without any. One gentleman expressed the hope that there never would be a constitution; it would spoil the conference.

At the first convention in 1910 there were twelve or fifteen in attendance; in 1915, about twenty-five and in 1920, about fifty. In 1942 there were 200 members who had paid their dues; in 1948 there were 515, including 88 students who attended the conference; in 1949, 558, including 108 students.

A remarkable achievement in the early days was the publication of a magazine entitled, "The Public Speaking Review," which is discussed in another article in this issue.

From 1911 to 1932, the Conference met at various colleges. There is evidence that the annual meeting was held at the following institutions—repeatedly at some colleges: Swarthmore, University of Pennsylvania, the College of the City of New York, Smith, Princeton, New York University, Drexel Institute, Harvard, and Columbia. In 1922 there was a joint meeting with the National Association of Teachers of Speech. The headquarters was at the McAlpine Hotel, but the meetings were held at New York University. Everett L. Hunt of Cornell University was President of the Association and Glenn N. Merry of the University of Iowa was President of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. There were two general sessions and nine sectional meetings. The program stated that it was necessary to have 250 individuals sign attendance in order to get a reduction in railroad rates.

In 1933 the Conference was held for the first time at a hotel, the Victoria in New York City. In 1934, the 25th anniversary of the Association,

the Conference was held at the Ambassador Hotel in Atlantic City. Gradually but definitely the programs increased in number. In 1939 there were two general meetings and ten sectional meetings, the highest number of sectional meetings ever organized up to that time. One year later, when the Association met in Washington, there were three general meetings and seventeen sectional meetings. That year the proceedings were published. In 1950 there was one general meeting and twenty-six sectional meetings.

It is interesting to note how much progress had been made in the planning of programs, and how much more territory was covered by the speeches given in the last few years. It was somewhat startling, however to find these topics in 1922: "Should Interscholastic Debating be Discouraged?" and "Could not the Course in Elementary Public Speaking be Coordinated with the Freshman Course in Written Composition Profitably?" Our forebears seem to have had remarkable foresight.

Up until the time of the Washington meeting in 1940, there had always been a Conference Dinner. I well remember those dinners. We dressed in our best evening clothes and attended in style. In 1940 the dinner was abandoned in favor of a luncheon, and the Conference Dinner has never been reinstated. The Association did not meet in 1943, 1944, and 1945 because of the war and the ban on conferences.

There are some special highlights in the history of the Conference which may be gleaned from an examination of the programs. In 1929 there was a sudden increase in the number of high school teachers participating in the program. From then on the names of high school teachers from New York and New Jersey appear regularly on the program.

In 1929, when the Association met at Princeton University, a stenographic record of the speeches and meetings was made. Alona Harrington, of Hunter College, purchased one of these for \$57. Her husband presented that report to the Archives of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference. In a letter written in 1929 Miss Harrington protested the cost because the record was not complete and not accurate enough to be of historical value. Many of the meetings were not reported.

The first stress on radio occurred in 1932.

From that time on discussion of radio has been a part of each yearly program.

When I first examined the 1935 program, I thought that there had been a division of the Association for there was a program headed, "College Division." No high school or elementary school teacher was represented on the program. Later I found a sheet marked "High School Division." The year is not indicated on that program. But since the days correspond, I judge that the high school program was held on Thursday and the college programs on Friday and Saturday.

The term "Speech Correction" first appears on the 1934 program in the title of a speech and in the professional title of a speaker. The program itself was called "Disorders of Speech". As the title of a program "Speech Correction" occurs first in 1935. The New York League for Speech Improvement first sponsored a program as part of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference in 1936. This same year the Annual Intercollegiate Poetry Reading Festival was a part of the program. The word "Discussion" as the title for a program did not appear until 1937.

The first eulogy for one of the charter members who had passed on in 1937 was given in 1938. John H. Frizzell paid tribute to Wilbur Jones Kay.

In 1938 something happened which apparently shook the foundation of the organization. There are references to "a disturbance" in two or three letters, but the references are so veiled that it is impossible to determine exactly what did happen. Considerable research will be required to find information about this historic event. Apparently no association can develop without one or two upheavals.

From correspondence between George Bohman and Professor Frizzell, it can be determined that the Eastern Public Speaking Conference was very active (even though the yearly conference was not held during World War II, in opposing the curtailment of speech as part of the Army's specialized training program. Apparently Mr. Bohman and Mr. Frizzell were vigorous in their appeals to the Speech Association of America, to Karl Mundt, and to other important persons in Washington.

The appearance of "The Bulletin" in 1948 is an event worthy of noting. Both Marvin Bauer, the first editor, and Evelyn Konigsberg, the sec-

ond editor, deserve commendation from the members of the Association for their editing of this publication. The fact that the Minutes of the 1949 meeting were published in the November, 1950, issue, will be of great value to the future historians of the Association. Another highlight in the history was the establishment of a placement service during the annual conference in 1949. Consultation hours were arranged between departmental chairman and candidates desiring positions.

Anyone examining the programs will be impressed with the outstanding speakers who gave of their time and energy to talk to the members of the Association. In 1922 Glenn Frank, then editor of the Century Magazine, spoke to the group, as did Dr. A. A. Brill. The theatre has been represented by Selena Royale, Lee Simonson, Brock Pemberton, Sir Cedric Hardwicke, Peggy Wood, Margaret Webster, Elissi Landi, Blanche Yurga, Alexander Kirkwood, Madeline Carroll, Donald Oenslager, and Arnold Moss; Radio, by Ben Grauer, Franklyn Dunham, Fulton Lewis, H. B. Summers, Earl McGill, Sterling Fisher; Literature, by Ashley Thorndike, George Philip Krapp, Walter Pritchard Eaton, Charles Sears Baldwin, Lane Cooper, Christopher Morley, Joseph Auslander; Language, by J. Duncan Spaeth, Thomas Knott; Public Affairs, by D. C. Poole, H. A. Overstreet, John Steelman, Eugene Myer, Major Charles T. Estes, Andrew Cordier, Roscoe Wright, George Gallup, Harold Laswell, J. B. Orrick, Sir Willmott Lewis, Arthur Bestor, Norman Thomas; Education, by Ordway Tead, Hollis Caswell, John L. Tildsley, Walter S. Harvey, Helen Mackintosh, Harold Benjamin; Religion, by John Haynes Holmes, Father Francis Donnelly, Percy Rector Stephens; Science and Medicine, by Dr. Wesley Hunt, Dr. Alfred Adler, Dr. Samuel Orton, Dr. J. C. Steinberg, Dr. Earl Carlson, J. O. Perrine, Dr. Earl C. Chester, Dr. John M. Lore.

It is interesting to follow the growth in use of equipment. In 1933 Angela O'Byrne demonstrated the use of the orthophonoscope in

relation to her topic, "Problems in Voice Production." In 1934 there was a round table discussion on phonographic recording as an aid in speech education. Recordings of narrative readings were also played. In 1940 great emphasis was placed on the use of audio and visual materials. The Voder was demonstrated in 1941 by J. O. Perrine, Assistant Vice-President of the American Telegraph and Telephone Company. From that time on considerable attention has been given to recording equipment, records, film and audiometers.

Professor Winans states that at one of the early sessions he alarmed many of the brethren by suggesting that research was possible for us. He says that he could not think of much in a concrete way that we could do in research, but he just allowed the idea was good. Since that time he wonders whether or not he is guilty of the things that have since been done in the name of research.

In the words of one of the elder statesmen, the conferences "have encouraged study, have broken down pet systems, have encouraged young people of ability to come in and work at the subject of speech seriously and have given us comradeship."

Looking back over the forty-two years of the Association, every one of us has reason to be proud of what has been accomplished in that time. With the firm foundation given us, it is the responsibility of those of us who are present members to see that the good work is carried forward. In order that we may have a clear picture, however, of what has been done I should like to recommend to the Executive Council that a committee be appointed to write the history of the organization so that we may have a complete and detailed picture in 1959, when the 50th anniversary will be celebrated. I should also like to recommend that appointments to this committee include an historian who can guide the method of research—a sleuth, who can run down every available lead, and someone who can make the primary sources "give."

What are the implications of classifying speech among the social sciences?

Are we sensitive enough to the needs of our students in relation to their predicted future?

What are the most pressing problems needing research in Speech?

What are the more significant contributions to the fundamental principles of rhetoric since Whately, Blair and Campbell?

The Public Speaking Review

By Giles Wilkinson Gray

In this the first issue of the new speech magazine, which is to be the official organ of the Speech Association of the Eastern States, it seems highly appropriate to take a backward glance at an earlier publication, also issued by the forerunner of the present Eastern association. Characterized by J. M. O'Neill as "our first professional periodical,"¹ it was, so far as is known, the first to be established, edited, and maintained by an organization entirely of teachers of speech. There had been earlier journals, but they were either private, commercial enterprises, or definitely house organs.² *The Public Speaking Review* was founded by the Public Speaking Conference of the New England and North Atlantic States, commonly known as the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, and now the Speech Association of the Eastern States. It had a short life. Published eight times during the school year, it ran through only three and a half volumes, from September, 1911, to December, 1914 a total of twenty-eight issues and 884 pages. But in those few years it encompassed a significant period in the history of American speech education, and contributed not a little to the developments that were taking place in that time.

The present Association of the Eastern States was organized in 1910 under the impetus of Wilbur Jones Kay, then of Washington and Jefferson and later of West Virginia University; James A. Winans, of Cornell, and Paul M. Pearson of Swarthmore.³ The first meeting was held in April 1910, at Swarthmore. It was at this meeting that a committee was appointed with power to act in the matter of establishing "a periodical devoted to the interests of public speaking," as "the most apparent need." The departments to be represented were declamation, oratory, extemporaneous speaking, argumentation, acting, drama, reading in schools, book reviews, criticism of speakers, and news items. As the *Review* developed, none of these was omitted, and others were added from time to time. It was more than a year, however, before the first issue appeared, with Frederick B. Robinson, later to become President of the City College of New York, apparently as head of the Editorial Board.

The *Review* was broad in its interests, going

far outside the area of public speaking; it was equally broad in its geographical appeal, declaring in the first issue that "The territory which the *Review* will represent is the entire country." By the end of 1913, and throughout the rest of its existence, its editorial staff included representatives from some eleven or more states, from New York to Washington, and from South Dakota to Louisiana; and in the Fall of 1914 it had been designated as the official organ of the National Speech Arts Association, formerly the National Association of Elocutionists.

As a primary source for a record of the events, the movements, the thought of the period as expressed by the contributors, the *Review* is of incalculable value. Material appears there which, it may be surmised, is to be found nowhere else. Movements had their origins there which led to revolutionary developments in American speech education. People whose names have become almost a byword in our profession published what are probably their first writings in those three and one-half years of *The Public Speaking Review*.

An extended article might easily be written on the significance of the little journal. Although it is difficult to limit the discussion rigidly, I shall in the interests of brevity limit my development to three outstanding features which, as much as any others, characterized the *Review*.

The first of these, in accord with the original intention, is the news items, which constitute a wealth of information about all sorts of activities. Accounts of contests, debates, dramatic performances, curricular developments, conferences, the migrations of various teachers, take up a significant amount of space. We are given an account, for example, of the founding in 1906 of Delta Sigma Rho, and in 1908 of Tau Kappa Alpha. The first issue reports that J. M. O'Neill had been made an assistant professor of oratory at Dartmouth, and that J. A. Winans was on sabbatical leave from Cornell. "Dr. Hardin Craig, who was in the Princeton University Department of English, with special work in debate, is this year in the Department of English in the University of Minnesota." The acting class at Swarthmore presented "The Blue Bird," "The Knight of the Burning Pestle," "Trelawney of the Wells," and "Antigone." And Glenn N.

Merry went to Illinois as an assistant in public speaking.

Syracuse University, in 1911, was offering eight courses in oratory, with 730 students enrolled; and Clarence E. Lyon left Yankton College to go to the University of South Dakota. The first performance in America of the Irish Players from the Abbey Theatre, Dublin, Ireland, we are told, was given at the Plymouth Theatre in Boston, September 23, 1911.

The October, 1912, issue reports that the English section of the NEA had set up an Oral English Committee, thereby creating the situation which ultimately led to the establishment of our Speech Association of America. In 1913 the Department of Oratory at Cornell University had four full-time teachers, and at the University of Texas Professor E. D. Shurter added three new instructors. The chapel exercises at Louisiana State University are described in November, 1913. "On Monday, the 27th of October, the University Dramatic Club presented two acts of Ingomar the Barbarian, instead of an address by a member of the faculty."

One item of news strikes a definite memory. The March, 1913, issue relates that "Mrs. Isabel Garghill Beecher comes to De Pauw under the auspices of the Department of Public Speaking. . . In the evening she is to read, 'All the World and His Wife.'" I had the privilege of hearing that reading. It was a striking narrative, superbly told, of the tragic consequence of careless irresponsible gossip. In October, 1911, she had contributed an article, "The Reader's Art."

News of the Tennessee Oratorical League is included, as well as of the Louisiana State University Dramatic Club. J. Q. Adams, Head of the Department at the latter institution, was very active in the Conference, and was on the Editorial Board for much of the time. The issue for January, 1914, carries a full page picture of R. L. Cumnock of Northwestern; the February issue one of Thomas Clarkson Trueblood, and the March issue one of Robert Irving Fulton of Ohio Wesleyan. Plans were announced to publish other pictures, but these three were the only ones that ever appeared.

These are only a few of the items in the news pages of the *Review*. One could certainly keep track of what one's colleagues were doing at the time; today those activities are no less interesting in retrospect.

A second significant feature of the *Review* consists of the contributions in its pages of an amazing array of people who were to become, to many of the younger members of our profession, almost legendary. These men and women discussed a wide range of subjects, stirring up controversies, presenting original theories, inciting movements which became, many of them, of great historical import. As early as September, 1911, Frederick B. Robinson was advocating "Oral English as a College Entrance Requirement," a subject that was discussed repeatedly. In October, 1913, he published an article on "The Place of Speech Training in General Education," a paper he had read in July to the National Speech Arts Association.

In October, 1911, J. A. Winans discussed "The Attention of the Speaker," based on a chapter in his "Notes on Public Speaking." His theories, adapted from the psychology of Titchener and James, were further developed in March, 1914, when he presented his ideas on persuasion, announcing at the same time that at the Spring meeting Woolbert was coming all the way from Urbana to discuss his theories. Winan's principles were put into published book form in his great book, *Public Speaking*, which made its first appearance the following year. Woolbert did give a paper, which, however, was not published in the *Review*. Winans said, "It made us wish that he would soon treat the subject more amply in book form."

In February, 1912, A. Booth Kuttner, indicated as "Dramatic Critic International," discussed "Stage Training in America," followed in a later issue by an article on "The Education of the American Actor," by Franklin H. Sargent, of the American Academy of Dramatic Arts. In May of that year Paul Pearson stirred up a lively discussion by his paper, "The Drama in the Curriculum," in which he stressed the "acting drama." This was the year in which George Pierce Baker established his "47 Workshop" at Harvard. Pearson was also much interested in reading. In the second volume of our own *Quarterly Journal* he published an article — his only one — on "Artistic Interpretation."

A surprising amount of attention was given to speech in the public schools. In the twenty-eight issues of the *Review* no fewer than twenty-nine papers appeared concerning phases of speech in the elementary and secondary schools. In Octo-

er, 1911, Robinson was discussing "The Teaching of Reading in the Schools;" and in December Dwight E. Watkins of Knox College was describing the high school debating league which had been organized among nine high schools of Illinois and Indiana. The very last issue ever published, December, 1914, contained a full description of the "High School Discussion Contests" which had been organized throughout Indiana. Many of us had the pleasure of hearing Miss Laura Aldrich at the 1952 Cincinnati Convention, with her remarkably beautiful speech. In March, 1912, she published an article on "Elocution in the Walnut Hill High School."

Whoever thinks that the use of recording apparatus in teaching speech is a relatively new technique should read the article by Charles M. Newcomb, of the University of Chattanooga, on "The Phonograph as a Aid to Classroom Work," which appeared in February, 1914. (As early as 1902 John R. Scott was using recording equipment at the University of Missouri.)

When Theodore Roosevelt's attack on inter-collegiate debating appeared in *The Outlook* for February 22, 1913, he was quickly and effectively answered in the October issue of that year by Professor Harry Bainbridge Gough of De Pauw University.

There is not enough space available even to mention the large number of excellent and scholarly papers which were published in the twenty-eight issues of the *Review*; these few will give some idea of their scope.

A third feature of *The Public Speaking Review* consisted in the theories, the movements, which had, if not their origins, at least an important phase of their development in its pages. For instance, when in December, 1912, John Taylor Adams of the University of North Dakota in his article on "The Evolution of College Debating," had advocated that judges without strong convictions on the question should be used, because they could more easily determine which side had arrived nearer to the truth, J. M. O'Neill took vigorous exception. Out of the controversy which followed, and which, indeed, carried over into several years of the *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*, came a clearer understanding of the nature of contest debating and of the function of the judge. Mention was made of the appointment of an Oral English

Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English. Because the members of the Committee could see in the work in public speaking no more than another aspect of English, attention became directed to the essential differences between the two disciplines. As a direct result of the controversy thus begun, the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking was organized in November, 1914, and plans were laid to start at once on the publication of a *Quarterly Journal*.

The "New Contest in Public Speaking," which S. H. Clark advocated in October, 1912, may not have been the impetus leading to the extemporaneous speaking contest of today; even though he borrowed the idea from a method developed at Lake Forest University, he did give it currency. Paul Pearson's bold advocacy of the teaching of dramatic techniques in May, 1912, aroused grave doubt as to the place of such material in the college curriculum, stimulating Winans' succinct comment, "Here is room for argument." Today no one questions its place.

A final impression one must inevitably gain from a careful study of this little old journal, seeing who were its sponsors, its contributors, who participated in the meetings of the Conferences, and who spoke out boldly and eloquently for a discipline in which they all believed so profoundly: what a heritage! To be able to draw from their wisdom, to benefit from their understanding, to follow the vision which they projected, and to advance, on the bases of what they bequeathed to their descendants, in the work they set out to accomplish, is a great privilege and a distinction. Robinson, Cumnock, Kay, Latham, Woolbert, O'Neill, Merry, Winans, Trueblood, Lyon, Harris, Bassett, Pearson, Clark, Fulton, Blanton, and a host of others are worthy of the highest honor; for these are the people who contributed to the concept of speech as an academic discipline, and not as a technique for exhibition. The journal which they established on an academic basis, even though it ran for only a short time, is a landmark in the history of American speech education.

FOOT NOTES:

1. Editorial, "The 'Public Speaking Review,'" *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*, II, 2 (April, 1916), 197-198.
2. Among these were Werner's Magazine (1879-1902), Expression (1895-1900?), published by the Curry School of Expression, and the Emerson College Magazine (1892-1920), which became the Emerson Quarterly (1920-1942).
3. Active in lecture and lyceum work, later Governor of the newly purchased Virgin Islands, and the father of the well known news commentators, Leon and Drew Pearson.

Broadcasting, 32-Year Old Gargantua

By Robert Haakenson

On election night, November 2, 1920, some five hundred to one thousand listeners, equipped with earphones, heard the Harding-Cox election returns over station KDKA, East Pittsburgh. With this first demonstration of a radio broadcast from a licensed government station, C. F. Lindsley reports, the era of broadcasting arrived.

In 1922 station WEAF in New York City, owned by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, sold some time to the Queensborough Corporation, a real-estate promoting firm. With this the era of commercial broadcasting arrived.

What has happened in the intervening thirty years is a phenomenon, almost beyond comprehension, which can be suggested by some recent statistics:

100,000,000 radio sets in the U. S.
2,400 standard broadcasting stations.
\$700,000,000 radio's gross annual billings.
48,000 employees in AM broadcasting.
21,000,000 television sets.
283 authorized television stations
(108 "prefreeze" stations, 175
authorized during 1952)
177 television cities (65 "pre-freeze").
10,800 employees in television broad-
casting.
\$300,000,000 estimated television gross bill-
ings in 1951.

It could be added that the broadcasts of the Presidential Inauguration on January 20, 1953, were available by radio to more than 98 per cent of our homes and to 27 million cars. Thirteen thousand stations of the four radio networks broadcast the proceedings. One network official said that more than half the nation's 150 million people could watch the Inauguration on television. Another estimated that the maximum potential audience would be exactly half, or 75 million. Of the four television networks in 74 cities, 118 stations carried the telecasts.

Another aspect of this phenomenon is suggested in television charges quoted in July, 1952. The cost of an hour ranged from \$375 at WSM-TV, Nashville, to \$4500 at WCBS-TV or WNBT in New York City. Network charges were quoted at \$31,250 an hour for a basic interconnected

group of 30 stations (not including all cable charges). For another network of 47 interconnected stations the rate was \$42,500 an hour. These are time charges. In addition, production costs of some hour-long programs were reported as being higher than \$50,000.

These figures on sets, stations, dollars and people give us some insight into the dimensions of this Gargantua but scarcely begin to suggest its influence. It would be difficult to overstate the effect broadcasting has had on our thinking, our standards, our habits, our politics and our national culture. The range of this influence may be illustrated by the fact that all-time highs in audience ratings were established by broadcasts of Franklin Roosevelt speeches and Joe Louis fights. Substantially more than half our people were reported to have heard Mr. Roosevelt's speech in which war was declared on Japan in 1941.

Broadcasting has progressed in thirty-two years from nothingness to a position of overwhelming importance. Some persons allege that it is now in a period of transition with the demise of radio and the advent of television. Others quickly deny the demise of radio. What are the major trends in broadcasting? Here are some:

1. The phenomenal growth of television.
2. The impact of television.
3. The continued expansion of radio.
4. A host of sharp controversies in television including:
 - a. Educational television.
 - b. Color television.
 - c. The television of football games.
 - d. "Closed-circuit" television or "phonevision."
 - e. Television standards.

The growth of radio after 1922 was of miraculous dimensions, but the expansion of television promises to eclipse that record. In 1946 there were 16,500 television sets; now there are 21 million. The prediction is made that the number of television stations may grow to 2500, the number of sets to 60 million, and the number of employees to 100,000.

The degree of impact of television is a debated point. There is some agreement, however, that for the first several months a set is in a

home, it exerts a profound influence. Family members stay home more, read fewer books, watch the set many hours per day, etc. Some studies have found that this influence diminishes as the novelty wears off, yet they conclude that a considerable influence persists. Television's impact on children diminishes more slowly. Reports are that children spend more hours per week in front of a set than in the classroom. Product sales promoted by the Howdy Doody, Hopalong Cassidy, Super Circus and similar programs run into astronomical figures.

On its first day in office, the new political administration acknowledged the impact of broadcasting. James Hagerty, press secretary to President Eisenhower, announced that efforts would be made to include radio and television perhaps once a month in press conferences.

The degree of impact is measured in other ways. Recent serious inroads on movie attendance are attributed almost entirely to television. The same is alleged for decreased attendance at athletic events.

Some spokesmen assert that television is tolling a death knell not for movies and athletic events alone, but for radio broadcasts as well. The decrease in commercial sponsorship of network radio programs and corresponding decreases in rates would seem to support this contention. The manufacture and sale of radio sets, on the other hand, continue to flourish. Gross billings and radio revenues have held up very well. The explanation is offered that while network radio has suffered, local radio has prospered.

The "bursting" of television upon the national scene since 1946 has produced many serious issues. One of the most important is educational television. Frieda Hennock, the only woman member of the Federal Communications Commission, crusaded for the setting aside of 25 per cent of all television channels for non-commercial purposes. This would amount to about 625 stations. The Commission ultimately allotted 242, approximately 10 per cent, which unfortunately, may prove to be more than the educators can handle.

One educational station, WOI-TV, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, was in operation before the Commission "froze" the assignment of channels. Since the end of the "freeze" in 1952, ten additional educational channels have been as-

signed. Rutgers University, New Jersey, and Washington University, St. Louis, are among those getting ready to go on the air. The State of New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and a group of midwestern universities are planning educational television networks.

The main problem is that only a fraction of the allotted 242 stations has been taken up, and those not taken up during the first half of 1953 will revert to unassigned status, available to commercial applicants. The chief obstacle for educational stations is, of course, finance. The most frequently heard estimate of the cost of station construction is \$350,000 and the annual cost of operation \$300,000. At hearings in New York State, witnesses scoffed at these estimates as being ridiculously low.

The recommendation is made that educational stations be allowed to do some commercial programming, such as is done by WOI-TV, Ames, Iowa. Others recommend that commercial stations be required to present a substantial amount of educational programming.

The controversy over color television fanned hot, then was allowed to cool. The basic issue seems to be the question of the superiority of the CBS "mechanical system" or RCA's (NBC's) "electronic system." One guesses that we could now have acceptable color television under either system, but a choice has to be made for uniformity.

After strong words were exchanged between the National Collegiate Athletic Association and such institutions as the University of Pennsylvania and Notre Dame, the impression is created now that the majority of colleges are satisfied that the NCAA experimental program of "controlled televising," with provisions for expansion in the 1953 season, is sensible and realistic.

"Closed circuit" television ("piping" telecasts into movie theatres where attendance is charged) has proven successful for prize-fights and for one opera from the New York Metropolitan. It has served both to maintain attendance at the actual event and to produce some revenue at the theatres. Zenith Corporation which developed "phonevision" (subscription television), declared that experimentation with first-run movies in Chicago proved the system feasible. It would seem comparable to "closed-circuit" television except for higher installation costs.

Concluded on Page 19

Teaching Speech In The Military Bases

By Merrill G. Christophersen

When the Commanding Officer and the Educational Officer of a military base are both enthusiastic about courses in speech and are willing to let you, a speech man, go about things in your own way, the situation is delightful. When the Camp Commander is dubious about the whole thing and the Educational Officer is indifferent, the situation is still not too bad, for (if there are any classes at all) you, the speech teacher, can still do things in your own way. But beware of camp authorities who say, "Here are your lesson plans. Teach the army way." If you take the plans, disregard them, and go on in your own manner, well and good. But if you cannot do this, forget the whole thing. Go home and read the best book you can find, for pleasure. The same thing holds true for the worst possible situation, which exists when the Commanding Officer and the Educational Officer are both openly opposed to the teaching of speech. This condition will leave you without a vowel to throw or a consonant to slur in front of anybody.

But things will probably go well and normally for you. You will have one or more classes to teach in speech at some army, navy, or air force base. The base commander will probably act as a welcoming agent for you. All you will have to do is to make the Educational Officer see things your way, so that you can best meet the situation as it is presented by the men themselves.

Military classes in speech should be one semester in length, or shorter. For it is a natural military condition that the men who form your classes will be shifted about and away from the camp in which you are teaching. They will be lucky if they are able to last out even a one-semester class. They might, furthermore, be shifted from job to job within the camp, and, as a consequence, they will probably have their hours of work changed just enough so that they'll have to miss your class, no matter how much they've come to like it. And the change in jobs might also change their objectives, so that they'll see other things as being more important for them than learning to speak better.

Take all this into consideration as you work out the objectives you'll be aiming at, and remember that, whatever objectives you choose, they must be ones that can be attained in one semester or less.

The men you teach (and the women too) will be as varied as the members of a college freshman speech class. The Commanding Officer might enroll (I've had two of them. One came the first night as an example to his men. The other attended two meetings of the class before he retired—he had a greater educational curiosity). Actually you'll find it's much easier in most cases to teach the men when the "top guy" isn't there. You'll get all grades and you'll get all ranks, men and women. And that's good. Military protocol lets them get along well enough together in a mixed class. There's a competition and an edge that's good when a private can see his colonel getting red about the neck, trying to make a speech that the private will have to admit is "pretty good." And the private will go all out to show the colonel that he can do as well, or better. Don't make any effort to separate officers and men. If the separation is done for you, that's another matter.

For the most part, the present personnel of our military bases consider themselves civilians on temporary duty with the armed forces. The rest, of course, are career persons, doing what they have chosen to do.

Of the group who consider themselves primarily as citizens on temporary duty, a part of them know what they will be doing when they get out of the service. This number also will think they know what they want to get out of speech classes for their personal benefit. These the teacher can use as a lever, a pry-bar, with which to work psychologically on the rest of the class. The teaching objective, as far as they are concerned, will be similar to the objectives in an evening school businessmen's class at a university.

In this same civilian army group are also the younger men just out of high school. They do not know what they will do when they get out of the armed forces. Some of them are learning a vocation while they are in the service, but, for the most part, they are merely marking time until the day of their discharge. They are in the service because they were forced in. Most of them are making the best of things, but their minds are not on any distant objectives.

Many of these high school graduates, however, will be enrolled in your classes because they want to take speech. These you can treat as you would treat entering freshmen in beginning speech

classes in college. You can also use them as levers to intensify the interest of others.

Some of the young fellows, though, will be in the classes simply because their superiors forced them to enroll. These must be enticed to stay in the class (or else they will affect some of the others in the wrong way), for your class is made or broken by the little remarks of interest or by the little remarks of disparagement which have been stimulated by what you do. Either kind of remarks can grow into blanket statements of approbation or disapprobation, as the result of which you become a hero or a goat. Remember that goats smell, and that all goats are not army mascots.

Use the trustworthy formula of praising before criticizing adversely; but use that formula with tact and common sense. Praise effort warmly, but briefly. Don't make the student, or yourself, ridiculous by overpraising effort when the result itself wasn't a too-brilliant speech accomplishment. And save for the student who speaks easily, but obviously without preparation, a short and penetrating criticism. Do not criticize him at length, for he probably looked good to the class, and they'll question your discrimination if you dig too sharply into him.

Make them all speak the first night you're there. Make everyone speak every time. Size up the group by the end of the second class meeting (if you're wrong in any instance you can easily reverse your opinion). Then call upon individual members in an order best suited to your purpose. Don't let them know ahead of time in what order they will speak (of course with some exceptions for specific reasons). Always call first upon the student who has a serious purpose in taking speech. He will set a tone to the session which will let you bridge, in any manner you wish, to your particular objective for that session. If you are careless and call first on someone who is uninterested and unprepared, you'll immediately be forced into making a negative approach toward your objectives. And it's good to intersperse those who are unprepared among those who are prepared, so that the contrast is obvious and doesn't have to be explained too much by you.

Some of your students will be professional military men. But, though there is a difference between the career man and the draftee, there are also many differences among the professionals

themselves. Part of them are glad of the opportunity to take a class in speech. They again should be used by you as levers to help you work on the other two major types of the professional group. The first of these is formed by the men who were told to attend class. These will absent themselves all they can. If you wish to develop them, you must stimulate them in many different ways. They can't be argued with, because they know all the answers they'll ever need.

The other type in this category is the group who come out of curiosity. They offer opportunity for easy victory on your part if you work on them in conjunction with those who are already interested.

All these are the types of persons you'll meet when teaching at a military base. Be careful never to work on one type singly. Always use those who are with you as levers to work on those who are indifferent or against you. Their attitude can do you a better service than your own words can do, directly.

The objectives aimed at by you as a speech teacher in the armed forces should certainly not be inferior to the objectives of the college classroom. True, they must be modified according to the makeup of each class. But they must move, nevertheless, toward an attempt to teach the basic principles of effective speaking. To weave the basic principles into whatever pattern your method may demand is doubly important in the military class. This is true because a part of your effort must be to combat the very effective propaganda of the "How to Win Friends and Influence People" sort of thing. Indeed, the Carnegie methods of speech teaching have become popular in many places throughout our land, including the curricula of our military preserves.

Your objective must move toward a development of the communicative skills. Begin at the very first meeting. Then it is that you set the tenor of your teaching. At that first meeting you catch the attention of your class in the way you wish—or you never will. At that first "get-together" you must sell yourself. Once you've done that the way becomes somewhat easier.

Do not attempt to give a specified amount of time to basic skills and to communicative skills. The secret is rather to do both as you go along, so that you actually insert the basic skills even as you discuss a particular communicative art. Do this when you are talking about a special prob-

lem with some student who has just demonstrated such a skill (or lack of it). After the second class meeting decide just what you are going to say to some six or seven individuals at each class meeting. And, when you do, always word your discussion so that all the other members of the class can apply what you say to themselves. For it is in this particular way that military classes differ from college classes. A college student feels relieved when the instructor leaves him out of the picture. But the military person tends to feel that the class isn't meant for him when the instructor's conversation doesn't directly concern him. And he'll find a way to avoid the obligation of coming to class. He'll do this at his first opportunity. Consequently, word both your praise and your criticism in such a manner that (1) The whole class will be glad that you said what you did (that they've acquired a bit of "secret" information they didn't know before), and that (2) Not only the individual you're talking to at the time but the entire class always takes what you say as if it were meant for every one of them.

The methods you use in teaching your classes within the armed forces should be your own. But it is best not to determine the particular method you will use for a given class until you have met that class twice. During those first two meetings determine what members compose the two or three groups of men or women who want to learn. From then on adjust your time so that it is those groups who get most of your attention. The other groups, those indifferent and those antagonistic, will tend to resent special attention directed toward them; whereas a casual treatment may well intrigue them so that many, or all of them, will eventually, by their own choice, drift in to become members of the interested groups.

Draw into your web those who have come through curiosity. Do this by an early praise of the improvement in the speaking of those who want to learn, those who are interested from the start. Show those who have to be in the class that you like them as men and women, but do not try to force anything upon them (even assignments) until they show by signs that they have become

a little interested. Then give them your attention casually. Soon they'll be eating out of your hands. It is a curious truth that the most antagonistic, if you treat them with a casualness appropriate to their distrustfulness, will, as they see others become interested, begin to demand more attention for themselves, forgetting that they didn't want to come in the first place.

Point out improvements immediately. Use suggestion in your voice, suggestion that you expect all along that they would improve. Ask a fellow to stop after class once in a while—but only to tell him of improvement and to suggest the lines of still further improvement. Don't ever ask one of these students to "stay after" in order to tell him "what's wrong." The word will get around.

If there are women in the class (and there will be in our modernized military arrangements) make no distinction between them and the men insofar as what is to be expected from them in the way of assignments. They are not used to that sort of distinction, and if you attempt to create divergencies of treatment you'll end up in trouble. Be courteous always, but realize that the women are competing with the men. The men will set the tone for you to follow with the women in the class.

One last caution. Let the class bring up its own issues for discussion. Treat any subject objectively, as if what is said in the classroom will not go beyond the classroom. The military understand their own taboos better than you will, and, strangely enough, there aren't as many taboos in a military establishment as you, an outsider, may believe. If you happen to be a veteran of a previous war, you will find, if you're objective (and not trying to prove you were just as good a soldier as they), that the approach which is natural today on many subjects has been changed sufficiently so that your approach (in a military sense) is already outdated. Be casual again. Let the men set their own definitions, their own approach to given questions, and advance their own solutions, entirely unhampered by you. And you'll find the class even more interesting than a college speech class.

Two Views of "Propaganda"

By Ross Scanlan

For over thirty years we have allowed the forces of despotism to take the initiative in propaganda. Back in the Twenties the Nazis wasted no time in setting up a *Reichspropagandaleitung* for the party, and less than two weeks after Hitler became Chancellor in 1933 they started on a *Reichspropagandaministerium* for the new government. In the same way the Communists in Russia established a department of Agitation and Propaganda as an important unit of the Central Committee of the All-Soviet Union. Literally thousands upon thousands of agents have worked at home and abroad under tight and systematic control of these organizations. Now, many years and one global war later, we in this country are beginning to recognize that propaganda is a major weapon; yet it is accurate to say that our efforts to date are largely experimental and exploratory.

Our actions will be governed by our attitudes, and the word "propaganda" may be an excellent barometer of our attitudes. Certainly it is significant that the phrase "American propaganda" now appears with some frequency in our newspapers and public discussions and with no implication of reproach. Until now we have used almost any other word—education, information, advertising, public relations, campaigning, rhetoric,—but "propaganda" was something bad. Today, even with the pressure of cold war and signs of a change in American policy toward propaganda, there is evidence that the old attitude of disapproval persists in some quarters of public opinion. In a sectional meeting at the last S. A. A. convention a speaker undertook to identify propaganda with rhetoric.* That proposition provoked lively opposition from other speakers on the panel and from a number of persons in the audience. To them rhetoric was good and propaganda evil.

In such discussion one might be tempted to ask: what's in a name? The inevitable answer is that attitudes form a clear link between the use of names and the course of actions. The contrast of attitudes toward "propaganda" and the corresponding divergence of actions on the part of democracy and despotism begin with the end of World War I. Despotism took up propaganda while democracy laid it down. By 1921 the Rus-

sian Communists, having sufficiently overcome the immediate crises that followed their seizure of power, started on the machinery of mass persuasion. In 1920, when Hitler joined the German Workers' Party, his primary objective was to get control of the new party's propaganda policies and operations. While all this was happening the people of America disarmed psychologically as well as physically. Along with our army and a large part of our fleet, we put propaganda in mothballs.

Two things will largely explain these diverse trends. First, there was the contrast between democracy and the new despotism in concepts of "peace" and "war." In our thinking war was an abnormal and temporary condition, and peace meant the absence of any significant base for hostility. To the totalitarians, whether Nazi or Communist, conflict was constant until all goals had been achieved. What the rest of the world called "peace" and "war" were, therefore, simply different phases of strategy in an unending struggle.

Secondly, during the first war stories of German atrocities had circulated widely in this country. Peasants were nailed to the doors of their barns, male children had their hands cut off, priests were tied to the bell-clappers of cathedrals. Whatever their origin, these stories did much to intensify our war effort. However, soon after the war, it was the prevailing opinion that these reports were false.

Thus propaganda acquired two negative connotations. It belonged to the finished and abnormal business of war, and it consisted essentially in the art of lying. From then on there were three sorts of response to the idea of propaganda: indifference, disapproval, and occasionally a kind of clinical interest. In the years that followed, and up until the present cold war, these responses did not change substantially.

A decade or so after the first war there was, perhaps, less indifference and more quasi-scientific analysis, but even among the analysts propaganda was generally regarded as an evil thing. Books like F. R. Lumley's *The Propaganda Menace* were written to show in how many ways it could be wicked: in purposes; in agents; in methods. The Institute for Propaganda Analysis, established in 1937, made an attempt to escape the limitations of this concept of evil by defining

* The reference is to the paper by Mr. Youngerman, which follows.

propaganda objectively as the "expression of opinion or action by individuals or groups deliberately designed to influence opinions or actions by other individuals or groups with reference to predetermined ends," and by a vigorous proclamation that we should judge propaganda as good or bad when it works for or against democracy. Yet, in its opening announcement, the Institute declared that "the propagandist is trying to 'put something across,' good or bad," and the burden of the Institute's work for the next four years was to illustrate certain devices," i. e. tricks, by which this was done. Here, actually, was the same stigma on propaganda: the view that even when it serves a good cause it is "putting something across" by methods that generally invite moral and intellectual condemnation.

No such attitude stood in the way of an effective use of propaganda by the totalitarians. In 1925, in the first edition of *Mein Kampf*, Hitler published his declaration that the effective use of propaganda was a "true art," warned his followers that it was carried on by Communists "with astound'g skill," and rejoiced in the observation that it was "practically unknown" among the democratic parties.

Another point of sharp contrast between democratic and totalitarian views lies in the emphasis we have put upon subtlety and indirection in propaganda. Time and again we have made a kind of intellectual Geiger counter out of propaganda-analysis. Nothing could be farther from the whole spirit and intention of the totalitarian propagandist. Even when he is working against an established democratic government he prefers, if possible, to work openly and conspicuously. Only when he is up against stringent repressive measures will he operate underground where the range and effectiveness of his efforts are limited.

"STIFF AND REPULSIVE CADAVER"

"Spoken speech is one thing, written speech is quite another. Print is the proper vehicle for the latter, but it isn't for the former. The moment "talk" is put into print you recognize that it is not what it was when you heard it; you perceive that an immense something has disappeared from it. That is its soul. You have nothing but a dead car-

Where, as in the Weimer Republic, the totalitarian propagandist is tolerated, he makes every effort to identify himself, his organization and its purposes as loudly as possible. He even makes no secret of his methods. The literature of Nazism and Communism is filled with candid discussions of effective propaganda methods. From 1931 to 1941 the Nazis published a trade journal for party propagandists that did not even carry the customary admonition: "for use only by the service." Alex Inkeles' very informative study, *Public Opinion in the Soviet Union*, published in 1950, tells us that the *Agitator's Guidebook* long ago became "the largest magazine and journal of any type in the Soviet Union."

If space allowed, other contrasts might be cited, but these are the principal ones. Over the years they have given the advantage of initiative and expediency to despotism. Today it is to be hoped that America will find the means to match enemy propaganda in effectiveness without sacrificing the standards of morality and intellect that distinguished democracy from the totalitarian order. Even as this paragraph is written the newspapers carry a front-page announcement of a new commission appointed by President Eisenhower. According to a special account in the *New York Times*, January 27, 1953, a board of nine members is appointed "to study the problem of unifying this country's psychological warfare to give it a dynamic thrust in the 'cold war.'" The story goes on to say:

Long on the President's mind, this country's loosely organized foreign information, propaganda and undercover operation may be reorganized drastically for the mission of countering the Soviet Union's aims. Included on the board were persons with considerable experience in psychological warfare who were believed to be dissatisfied with the present setup.

cass left on your hands. Color, play of feature, the varying modulations of the voice, the laugh, the smile, the informing inflections, everything that gave that body warmth, grace, friendliness and charm and commended it to your affections—or, at least, to your tolerance—is gone and nothing is left but a pallid, stiff and repulsive cadaver." — Mark Twain.

Propaganda And Public Address

By Henry C. Youngerman

I plead with *unconcealed* argument (unlike the propagandist!) that propaganda has been too long a psuedo myth by which we have distinguished a member of our public address family. It is our duty to recognize it as a close relative. In our speech classrooms, audience analysis reveals cleanly the presence of propaganda along with other forms of speech.

"Propaganda" is an epithet applied to illegitimate public address. Propaganda elevates technique above content; its aim is the completely emotional motivation of the audience, rather than the ethical instruction of the audience. If, in our classrooms, techniques are taught as manipulative devices, then we teach propaganda. The establishment of technique-ethos relationship constitutes legitimate public address.

Our speech texts seem to rest content with brief references to propaganda and propaganda analysis. They reflect public opinion in ascribing evil intent only to the propagandist. They do offer arguments for rationalization as a factor in persuasion. However, their failure to discuss propaganda adequately does not rule out the fact that the student in search for know-how does not overlook the gimmick or the slick device for selling himself.

The line between propaganda and public address is a very fine line. It is a line revealed by audience analysis. Audience analysis is crucial to the propagandist; he spends much time and effort upon it. If his analysis is inept, the penalty is sure and swift. All too often the public speaker takes insufficient time for audience analysis, although the penalty is equally sure, if not so swift. We must make valid our references to ethical behavior by adding an objective analysis of the classroom audience situation. Honest and dishonest student speakers alike can then measure the results of their speeches. They can aim toward a real effect, whether they be propagandists or ethical persuaders. Public address in our classrooms is propaganda when the real audience is reduced to the status of a *phantom* audience.

It is propaganda for a phantom audience when the real audience accepts the phantom status by open or even unspoken agreement to imagine itself in other than the real situation. It is a phantom audience when interest in certain speech subjects is *ascribed* to the student listeners—when

attitudes are *understood* to be operative—when audiences willingly suspend disbelief as though in attendance at a play. It is a phantom audience when the speaker is permitted to assume that he is already in a business or professional role he expects to have after graduation. This willing acceptance of the role of phantom audience renders the listener suggestible, makes him open to unthinking acceptance of ideas and attitudes.

I emphasize the factor of audience analysis because of the nature of the classroom situation. Propaganda is an emotional, non-logical form of persuasion. It is more than that. It is anti-logical, for the solution precedes the problem. Many classroom practices seem to condone this kind of preparation. A student is called upon to make a speech. He seizes upon a subject such as the need to prevent eyestrain. He gathers materials from superficial readings. He may count eyeglasses in the classroom. The solution precedes the problem because listener attitudes are taken for granted or rationalized. "Success" along these lines breeds not only more and similar ideas of what constitutes "success" but contempt for the audience as well.

Such a speaker is, as Doob says,¹ an unintentional propagandist. Or, as Lasswell says,² he is speaking with a minimum of premeditation. The audience is particularly susceptible because listening is directed primarily toward evaluation of speaking skills and only secondarily towards content. The emphasis is all too often upon speaker-skill relationship without necessary emphasis upon subject-audience relationship. Emphasis upon skills alone has never ruled out sophism.

Propaganda and public address are names, labels, for the *effects* of the message. The name is applied by the listener. The listener seeks protection in the popular notion that propaganda is always being handed out by that "other person" or by that "other group." How shall an audience protect itself until it has experienced effective charting of its attitudes?

Altogether too many people have became hypnotized by propaganda, particularly of the Russian type which is regarded as clever in the extreme, unlimited in its sources, and terribly certain of its targets. We have too easily accepted for our stereotype that we are a people given over to worship of the know-how, the technically

clever, the well-greased machine. The majority may merely pause to admire the machine of propaganda and move on without buying its products—"just looking." The minority come to look and remain to buy because they as an audience have been conditioned to absorb clever techniques as a socially acceptable substitution for real ideas. We of the majority are not saved thereby from envy and subsequent loss of esteem for the belief that if we can explain the phenomenon we have explained away the thing itself. An audience in the classroom or in public is fascinated by the clever machine, is open to suggestion, to hypnosis.

Are propaganda and public address alike in terms of purpose and methods? The speech to inform can be indoctrination. Like speaking to convince, propaganda works to change the content and direction of behavior through influencing opinion. Like speaking to stimulate, propaganda works to renew faith in certain basic cultural concepts. Like speaking to actuate, propaganda uses emotional appeals and rationalization.

I am sure that we do not need here a detailed comparison of psychological methods assigned to propaganda and to public address.³ Most obvious of these is the theatrical element of auxiliary-related responses, such as utilizing platform dignitaries, music, group responses, and flags. These have become stereotyped to many as almost infallible hallmarks of propaganda. Equally obvious are repetition, variation, and use of striking and startling statements. Just as obvious is our emphasis upon the emotional. We stress listings of desires and motives, the influence of prestige, the desire for submission, and broadening of emotional appeals to meet increased audience size.

Less obvious, perhaps, are the factors of limitation and simplification. Limitation may elicit favorable responses even when it consists of facts, distortions, or the fabrication of pseudo-facts. Are we encouraging these methods when we teach our students to "use facts as people know them"? As for simplification, reduction of the complex to manageable form, do our texts place sufficient stress upon avoidance of oversimplification?

Do we not teach the equivalent of Doob's classes of *revealed*, *concealed*, and *delayed-revealed* propaganda? Often, we teach the need for delayed or indirect revelation of purpose at an appropriate time in the speech—if revelation at all.

Finally, when we take up the general subject

of persuasion and attitude formation, we find much similarity if not identity. Like the merchant who sells a "leader" at below cost, our speakers are urged to admit general agreement along certain lines to allay suspicion or to provide a "yes-response" for the main ideas. As to previous attitudes, we have always taught that they can be relied upon to provide the basis for learning new ideas. In connection with attitudes, we should consider the recently published conclusions of World War II psychological experiments on indoctrination.⁴ These generally confirm what we have been teaching for many years: (1) people are more influenced when they do not know the speaker's purpose or consider it to be merely expository; (2) positive rather than negative suggestion should be used; (3) counter propaganda or persuasion will convert unbelievers but provokes doubt among believers; (4) the presentation of only one side of the argument is more effective among men already convinced. The inclusion of both sides of the argument works to affect those opposed more than those already in initial agreement. All this is hinted very succinctly by Ewbank and Auer: "We should note in passing that the processes of persuasion and propaganda are practically identical."⁵

Our summary, then, must be that propaganda and public address are alike in general purposes and methods. They differ chiefly in recognition of conscious anti-logical intent. Whereas the propagandist cheerfully admits that he makes people think they want what he gives them, we generally refuse to admit that we do exactly what the propagandist does. Worse yet, when confronted with malpractices in our classrooms, too many of us tend to rationalize by merely relating that we, ourselves, are motivated by high-sounding principles of rhetorical ethics.

Shall we continue, then, to remain satisfied with seeking honorable mention for ethical intent? Or shall we emphasize attention to the listener in public address, as is done in propaganda? The audience is the target in both cases. If we focus only upon speaker-speech relationships we are teaching skills alone. If we concentrate upon speech content analysis, we have opened the way to overemphasis upon the magic of words. Perhaps, we should teach the seven propaganda detection devices of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis? But I submit that these devices are learned very early in life in family and neighbor-

hood activities. A moment of retrospection will remind any parent that the child masters everything from "name calling" to the "band wagon" device. And, after all, the "plain folks" device may be translated into our advice to speak informally at the start of the speech in order to identify ourselves with the audience. The "band wagon" device may find itself in some of the aspects of establishing common ground. And "glittering generalities" are first cousin to the use of desirable stereotypes. These devices should not be taught by us for use primarily in criticism of the speeches made by others. The devices should be disciplined as to intent when used by our students in their own speeches.

I urge, instead, emphasis upon audience analysis as the major part of our work. There are many methods available to the classroom. I begin with the obvious one of quantitative measurements as to age, sex, major courses, activities and membership in societies. Early in the term, expressions of attitudes toward a variety of opinion statements may be obtained. I use a series of theme sentences obtained from speeches made during preceding semesters. I also present a group of real situations. Attitudes expressed range all the way from complete approval to complete disapproval. Students then study individual and group profiles of reactions to these attitudes. Then, before-and-after expressions of listener-attitude become meaningful learning aids in providing speakers with direct and concrete objectives. All such surveys reveal significant differences in attitude toward concepts such as force, power, authority, faith, and individual and collective responsibility.

Attitude surveys reveal both group and individual patterns and thus underscore the need for self-analysis. Know thyself, we say to our students. If one is to analyze an audience, one must begin with self-analysis. Analysis of a community is clearer when one's own profile of attitudes is compared with that of the community.

Two factors are essential to audience analysis.

First since speeches are aimed at a consensus provided by the classroom audience, the significance of differences must be explored as well as that of similarities. We must remember that propaganda depends upon generalities—upon simplification, upon leading us into loss of individuality. Second, to provide significance to attitudes and opinions taken directly from this real audience, student and instructor must join forces to discover application of public address techniques.

Phantom audiences will be eliminated when consensus becomes culturally valuable to the student. The relationship between speaker and audience must be clear. Attitude profiles develop organic listener participation by heightening awareness of being in a real audience. The listener knows that he, personally, is being addressed. The student speaker will no longer be playing-at-the-role of public speaker.

Audience analysis reveals attitude patterns, the concretizations of cultural concepts which identify experiences. Without knowledge of attitudes or without understanding of such knowledge, all efforts at communication are blind. It is blindness to assume that one's own pattern of cultural concepts is culturally operative for the entire target audience. When available knowledge of attitudes is ignored or rationalized, persuasion in the classroom becomes the blindest of propaganda.

FOOT NOTES:

1. Leonard W. Doob, *Public Opinion and Propaganda*, N. Y.: Henry Holt and Company, 1948; p. 246.
2. Harold D. Lasswell, Ralph D. Casey, Bruce L. Smith, *Propaganda and Promotional Activities*, Minneapolis: U. of Minn. Press, 1935; p-4.
3. Doob, *op. cit.*, pp. 315-396. Terminology descriptive of propaganda techniques taken from these pages.
4. Carl I. Hovland, Arthur A. Lumsdane, Fred D. Shefield, *Experiments on Mass Communication*, Vol. III, Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1949, pp. 265-277.
5. Henry L. Ewbank and Jeffrey J. Auer, *Discussion and Debate*, N. Y.: Appleton Century Crofts, 1951, p. 240.

OBJECTIVITY VERSUS CONVICTIONS

The social sciences (including Speech) deal with the very basic stuff of human nature and of human values. Can we not—indeed must we not—hypothesize our research upon the conviction that fundamental values such as freedom, individual

integrity, loyalty to ideals and to the common good must be maintained, rather than simply analyzed? As the twentieth century has moved away from absolutism toward relativism in moral standards, have not the results been disintegrative? These columns are open to such debate.

Why Group Discussion In The Liberal Arts Curriculum?

By James M. Lewis

WANTED. A man who must be able to think clearly, express ideas effectively, have substantial background of information in many areas, be interested in public problems and anxious to help solve them.

This "Wanted" advertisement might have been placed by your organization, your school, or your community. A person with these qualifications would benefit any group to which he belonged. He would be an interesting and worthwhile person to know, a good employee or a good boss—certainly a good citizen.

Aren't we always looking for such people? Because of this ever-present and, perhaps, increasing demand, those of us in the liberal arts colleges are trying to develop students with these qualities. We think that the liberal arts curriculum should give the student training which will result in a person who knows how he ought to live and has both the knowledge and the will to do so. The graduate of the liberal arts college should be, to use a rather strained analogy, more like a library than a textbook; he should be well informed in many areas rather than in only one. More specifically, we want to graduate students who fulfill the requirements of the "Wanted" advertisement given above.

"All right," you ask, "but how does group discussion fit into the picture with the liberal arts curriculum and its goals?" To answer this question let's start with one of the goals of the liberal arts curriculum and compare it with one of the goals of group discussion. Let's take an experience that we have all had. It might have happened while you were a student, while you were working at your present job, in connection with a club to which you belong, or as a result of a hobby which you started. Whatever the activity was, don't you remember noticing that even though you might not have had much interest at first, as you worked at it your interest increased; the more you worked the more interested you became? I think that we will all agree that active participation usually results in increased interest, whether it be in discussion, dramatics or baseball.

In discussion we are actively searching for the solution to a problem and, therefore, the problem itself becomes more significant to us. When we

help our group solve an important problem by using our knowledge of the facts and our ability to think clearly in effectively contributing these facts to the discussion, we are developing in the subject area an active interest that will probably be sustained. In discussion, then, we have found an important means of helping to achieve one of the goals of the liberal arts curriculum—that of developing an interested awareness of public problems.

Does group discussion fit in as well with the other goals of the liberal arts curriculum? Let's try it. Perhaps it will be best to start by asking the double question, "What does the individual contribute to the group, and what does the group give to the individual in discussion?" Anyone who has worked with discussion groups has noticed the participants become, on the whole, much better informed. The discussion participant brings information into the discussion which he has gained through experience and "reference" reading. He will also receive information from the other members of the group. It seems to fit quite well since a well informed person is one of the goals of the liberal arts curriculum which was mentioned previously.

But along with the possession of such knowledge we must be able to use it effectively. To use knowledge effectively we must be able to think clearly. In this respect, discussion is important in that it tends to "refine" the thinking of the participant in two ways. First, the discussion participant must verbalize his thoughts. To express effectively what he thinks, he must arrange his thoughts in easily understandable form. In other words, the first step in the refinement process is that of clarifying what we think so that others will be able to understand us. This might be called a function of the individual. The second step in the process is a function of the group. That is, if the thinking of the individual has been erroneous it will be questioned by the group. When this happens the participant must either successfully defend his statement, (which he usually does by further explanation of his reasons for thinking as he does), or he must correct his error by revising his statement. This, then, is another value of group discussion which parallels one of the goals of the liberal arts curriculum. Discussion helps the participant become better

able to express his thoughts effectively and to become better informed as a result of critical evaluation and addition of information.

Have you ever thought of the term "balanced thinking" in connection with group discussion? Probably you have, because it seems exactly to describe one of the most important aspects of group discussion. Some of the first advice that the beginner in group discussion gets is that he should not be concerned with proving or attempting to force acceptance of his point to the exclusion of others. He learns to expect some of his ideas to be compounded with ideas of other participants in achieving the group solution to the problem. In this way the discussion participant learns to give and take. He sees that the group actually thinks together. When the participant learns to expect this exchange of ideas he tends to listen objectively to those ideas with which he disagrees. As a result of this objectivity he begins to focus his criticism on ideas rather than on personalities. Such objectivity is, you will remember,

another of the goals of the liberal arts curriculum, and is one that is especially well taught through group discussion.

I think that you will agree it is vitally important that we have people who are well informed in many areas, who can think clearly and can express themselves effectively, and who are interested in public problems and are anxious to help solve these problems. If we are to have such people, we must use the best available methods in their education. It is for this reason that I have stressed the importance of group discussion. It is important because it is an excellent means of supplementing and substantiating those things which are the basis of the liberal arts curriculum. I like to think of group discussion and the liberal arts curriculum as producing students who are, if you remember the trylon and perisphere symbol of the New York World's Fair, perispheres rather than trylons—well rounded rather than pointed on top.

Broadcasting Gargantua

Continued from Page 9

Because television gains entry into the family living room, because of its impact, and because of its proven influence on children, high standards—of quality as well as decency—should be imposed. In its short history, television frequently has been indicted. One of its first excesses was a disproportionate showing of crime programs, many of them in the early evening before children's bedtimes. Researchers in one city tallied the number and types of crimes, manias, underworld techniques, etc., and the result was quite horrifying.

In its early stages, television chose to exploit the plunging neckline, a fascination it has not been able to overcome. The industry has been more or less continuously under fire, also, for other types of undress and assorted displays of passion. Advertisements are roundly criticized for being too frequent, too long, and in poor taste. Some viewers demand that beer (like liquor) advertisements be prohibited. Implicit in the question of standards is the principle of free speech. The case of Mr. George S. Kaufman's being dropped from "This Is Show Business" in December, 1952, symbolizes this issue.

Viewers and television critics continuously goad the networks, the stations and the agencies, charging that they present too many variety and panel programs, too many mediocre and poor programs, and too few artistic and significant programs.

This department has endeavored to set forth what has happened in television and, in general, what is happening. The next issue will describe special events and speechmaking on television.

WHO OUT-TALKED WHOM?

In a *Life* magazine article for March 2, Adlai Stevenson gives an intriguing picture of what it means to conduct a campaign for the presidency. A further indication is given by these figures on the number of speeches (as catalogued in the *New York Times* for November 3, 1953, page 15, column 7) given by some of the principal figures in the campaign:

John Sparkman	400 to 450
Richard Nixon	375
Dwight Eisenhower	228
Harry Truman	210
Adlai Stevenson	203
Robert A. Taft	38

William Maclay

First Senator from Pennsylvania

1737 - 1804

By Frank Merritt

The first Senate of the United States was a distinguished body of men. Eleven of its twenty-six members had been framers of the Constitution. Many others such as Philip Schuyler of New York, Charles Carroll of Maryland, and Richard Henry Lee of Virginia were widely known patriots. Others were accomplished speakers like the astute Oliver Ellsworth and the fiery Southerners such as Pierce Butler, Ralph Izard, and William Few. One of the most frequently heard, but not the most distinguished of the first Senators, was William Maclay of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, elected to the first Senate along with Robert Morris of Philadelphia, the great financier of the Revolution.

Maclay, a lawyer by training and a veteran of the French and Indian and the Revolutionary Wars, was a leader in the early development of Pennsylvania. His major occupation was surveying. Between 1764 and 1788 Maclay surveyed most of the land in Northumberland and Berks counties. He also surveyed Lewisburg, and laid out the cities of Sunbury and Harrisburg.

Maclay seems always to have combined his professional interests with public service. During his early years in Northumberland he held, at various times, many local offices. He was elected representative of Northumberland County to the Pennsylvania Assembly three times. In 1784 he was one of the commissioners to the Indians at the making of the Treaty at Fort Stanwix, New York. During the years 1786-88 he was elected a member of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania. After his retirement from the Senate in 1791, he was elected to the State Legislature, where he took a controlling part in shaping legislation, settling land titles, and obtaining Harrisburg as the capital of the State. He was a Presidential elector in 1796 and Associate Judge of the Dauphin County Courts from 1801-1803.¹

Maclay, a fervent democrat, was an outstanding spokesman against Alexander Hamilton and the forces of Federalism which dominated the first Senate. Maclay had imagined that he would find at the seat of the new republican government noble men, devoted to the interests of their constituents, who would decide on principles of

reason and justice what was best for all the people. He found instead many men who were often, consciously or unconsciously, devoted to the interests of their own class or faction, who more often than not managed the passage of legislation not by means of noble oratory, but by bargains and coalitions formed outside the legislative halls.

He found also, he believed, leanings toward an aristocratic and kingly government. Maclay was contemptuous of kings, holding them to be both useless and burdensome.²

He rejoiced in the news of the French Revolution, saying:

Royalty, nobility, and vile pageantry, by which a few of the human race lord it over and tread on the necks of their fellow mortals, seem likely to be demolished with their kindred Bastile, which is said to be laid in ashes.

Maclay favored plainness in the new government. When the Secretary of the Senate called Washington's first address to Congress "his most gracious speech" Maclay was the first to object to the term as smacking of British monarchy.

He viewed the new government as being representative in form. "We come here," he said "the servants not the lords, of our constituents. The further any measure is carried from the people, the less their interests are attended to." It seemed to him, therefore, that Hamilton's schemes for assuming and funding the debts of the Revolution were designed primarily to enrich the speculators, while they ignored the original financial supporters of the Revolution, the many common people, who had given their savings and later had been forced to sell at greatly depreciated prices.

Like a great many of his countrymen Maclay was distrustful of the Constitution. "I am afraid," he wrote, "that it will turn out the vilest of traps that ever was set to ensnare the freedom of an unsuspecting people." It seemed to him that the Constitution would permit a gradual extension of the powers of the executive, a weakening of the powers of the Senate, and a gradual loss of the powers of the States. Though he held the voice of

the majority to be sacred, he thought that it was often unwise. He especially feared that the people would ignore the best men and elect demagogues until one "more artful than the rest, to perpetuate his power, (would) slip the noose of despotism about (their) necks."

Maclay spoke often and freely on the measures before the first Senate—on titles and ceremonies, the first tariff, the judiciary bill, the permanent residence of Congress, the assumption and funding bills, on opening the doors of the Senate, and relations with France. He made notes of what he and others said, which are preserved in his *Journal*. These notes reveal, in part, his own skill as a speaker. They also reveal Maclay's views on speakers and speeches and form the only extensive record of what occurred behind the closed doors of the first Senate.

Maclay believed that persuasion was based on understanding:

When every word conveys an idea and sentiment follows expression, the composition is good, but when the words and expressions are so happily arranged that every corresponding idea and sentiment brings a kindred group in its train, the composition rises to excellent, grand, sublime. . . . When the ideas follow slowly, with difficulty, or not at all, the composition may be termed heavy, dull, stupid.

He thought Washington's first address to Congress was of the latter sort. Maclay's comments on the method and style of his colleagues' speeches are not nearly so numerous as are his comments on the manner in which they were delivered. Maclay found Washington wanting in poise on the occasion of his first address to Congress.

This great man was agitated and embarrassed more than ever he was by the level cannon or pointed musket. He trembled, and several times could scarce make out to read, though it must be supposed he had often read it before. He put part of the fingers of his left hand into the side of what I think the tailors called the fall of the breeches. . . . changing the papers into his right hand. After some time he did the same with the fingers of his right. When he came to the words *all the world*, he made a flourish with his right hand, which left rather an ungainly impression.

Maclay was far from satisfied with the "sweet-

ness and light" shed on public questions by the debates in the first Congress. He described the Senate as a place where:

. . . there is no harmony of soul, no wish to communicate a happy sensation . . . (where) all is snipsnap and contradiction short, where it is a source of joy to place the speech of a fellow Senator in a distorted or ridiculous point of view. . . .

On another occasion he was equally severe on the House:

The House have certainly greatly debased their dignity, using base invective, indecorous language; three or four up at a time, manifesting signs of passion, the most disorderly wanderings in their speeches, telling stories, private anecdotes, etc.

The only record of Maclay's own speeches is to be found in his *Journal*. In many instances he merely noted the points he had made that day. At other times, however, he inserted long passages that have the ring of oratory. The fragmentary remains show that Maclay was a careful craftsman with considerable oratorical power.

Maclay was especially conscientious about obtaining sufficient factual material on which to base many of his speeches. While the major portion of his materials was drawn from his own interpretation of the political and economic philosophies of Locke and Rousseau, from the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and ancient and modern history, he made special efforts to obtain evidence from other sources. Maclay assiduously sought statistical materials from friends, colleagues, and public officials. In preparing his speeches on the tariff, for instance, he obtained an account of the sugarhouses from Representative Muhlenberg, a list of Pennsylvania's protective duties from Representative Fitzsimmons, who also gave him some statistics on the trade of the United States and a list of imports into Pennsylvania and Virginia. He tried, without success, to obtain "London prices current" from Senator Morris, and sent for and received an abstract of imports into Philadelphia from the collector. Another report on the trade of the port of Philadelphia he received too late to be of use. His *Journal* contains frequent complaints about his inability to obtain needed information.

Maclay was an able debator. He stated his own arguments clearly, simply, and forcefully, and was adept at harrassing his opponents.

One of his first debates in the Senate arose over the question as to how the President should be addressed. A group which included Senators Lee, Ellsworth, Izard, and Vice-President Adams favored a more resounding title than "Mr. President." William Maclay, seconded by Carroll of Maryland, led the opposition. The issue was joined May 8, 1789.

Maclay wrote that after Ellsworth's speech he "sat . . . for a considerable time, to see if anybody would rise." At last he rose and replied. As a result of new light, he said, which had been shed on government within the last twenty years, respect for titles had diminished and men no longer felt compelled to imitate the past. Furthermore, he averred, it was not only the natural adoration of the people, but also the brutality of the masters which had extorted titles, and, as a result of the latter, the people now had a horror of kingly authority. When Maclay resumed his seat, his speech stimulated a series of warm replies. Izard of South Carolina stressed the antiquity of kingly government. Ellsworth declared that the title of President was too common. Adams remarked contemptuously that there were presidents of fire companies and cricket clubs. Lee said that the constitutions of some States authorized titles.

Maclay, unabashed by the numbers and prestige of his opponents, collected himself for an other effort. Aiming at their strongest argument, he read the clause in the Constitution which forbade granting of titles of nobility. They were, he said, "forbidden fruit." He concluded with an appeal not to vote contrary to the House of Representatives, which had voted against titles, and so characterize the Senate as aristocratic.

The Senate, however, voted not to accept the House report. Izard moved the title "Excellency," but withdrew it, when Lee suggested "Elective Highness." He urged that a dignified title for the executive would increase the impressiveness of the new government and cited the titles of the Grand Turk and the princes of Germany.

Maclay's rebuttal was sharp. He declared that a title could not possibly add to the present universal respect felt for Washington. In fact he felt that it would be degrading to place him on a par with princes and dukes of the blood, for none of them "could enter the list of true glory with him."

But Maclay could not yet prevail. The whole

matter was referred to a committee which reported back that it favored the title: "His Highness the President of the United States of America and Protector of the Rights of the Same." Adams was reported as saying: "What will the common people of foreign countries, what will the sailors and the soldiers say, 'George Washington, President of the United States?' They will despise him to all eternity. This is, he added, all nonsense to the philosopher, but so is all government whatever."

Maclay rose again. The Constitution, he said, called the head of the government *President of the United States of America*, a title which could not be changed without infringing the Constitution. Neither the President nor the Senate could do what the Constitution forbade, and it forbade grades, orders, and titles of nobility. What the people of foreign countries might think of us because of this prohibition was not important. Admittedly titles are nonsense, he said, not only to a philosopher but to every wise man. But *government* is not nonsense, but necessary. The labors of philosophers have been directed toward correcting the vices and follies of government and basing it on the common sense of merchants, farmers and mechanics as our own government is based. It would be a sorry thing if their labors were in vain.

The motion for postponement was carried after Maclay finished. On May 14th the Joint Committee reported that the Senate favored the title "His Highness," but would for the present consent to the title of President. A general postponement of this report was adopted. Maclay wrote: "I have, by plowing with the heifer of the other House, completely defeated them."

Maclay's logical proofs were energized by a forceful, often figurative, style which he hoped would touch the moral feelings of his audience. In introducing his argument on the funding system he said with heavy irony:

I will suppose (suppositions are common in this House) that not one member of Congress has been influenced by any personal motive whatever in arranging the American funding system, which now spins on the doubtful point of pass or not pass; and, as it falls, may turn up happiness or misery for centuries to come. No, I will take gentlemen at their word, and believe that it is the glare of British grandeur, supposed to follow from

her funds, that has influenced their conduct.

Occasionally, but probably not often, he waxed humorous and ridiculed his opponents, as when in the debate on titles he argued that by the rules of fair play the title "highness" should be given to the tallest American, perhaps, a Patagonian; or by the rules of logic to the man in the moon.

But Maclay could make eloquent appeals to the loftier moral feelings of his listeners. The peroration to his speech on behalf of French commerce in the tariff debate moves with force, dignity, and elevated thought:

What, then, is to be done? Repeal the law, but upon a different principle from that held out by the Secretary either in his second or third alternative. The second is sordid, as having advantage as its basis; the third carries something like an airy insult, as much as to say: We are right, you are wrong, but take it; our good nature shall yield to your peevishness. . . . Where would have been our Washington and patriots of every grade had it not been for French interference? No, let us do homage to the spirit and the letter of the treaty, own our mistake, and repeal the law.

Maclay's physical presence must have been impressive as he delivered such skillfully constructed periods. Six feet three inches tall, with brown hair tied behind in a club, and a scarlet ruffle at his throat, his appearance and bearing were dignified, majestic. But his speeches do not indicate that he had any gift for conciliating his listeners. Strongly opinionated, he also had the habit of stating his own ethical position with an air of righteousness: "I know of but two lines of conduct for legislators," he would say, his own and that of tyrants. Maclay consistently followed what he thought was right on measures such as the funding and assumption bills and the permanent location of the government, even though he knew that he was alienating the powerful financial figures of Philadelphia and losing all chance of reelection. There is no doubt that he was proud of his strength of character in the midst of so many evil men. To his colleagues he must often have appeared as cantankerous, scolding, and Puritanical. Strongly suspicious of the motives upon which his colleagues acted, he held the Federalists, and especially Hamilton, to be wholly self-seeking, dishonest, and ambitious for

power. He was sometimes brutally frank about his suspicions. Completely unable to win the confidence and respect of William Morris, whom he despised, he was also not popular with the Pennsylvania delegation because of his plain, blunt speech at their caucuses and dinners. It is for these reasons that Maclay cannot be called, as he has sometimes been, the first leader of the American Democracy. A leader must have a following and there is little evidence of one in the *Journal*. His "friends" had a habit of not voting as they had promised or implied they would. Though Maclay did speak and fight for democracy, it was not until Jefferson arrived on the scene that a cohesive and effective democratic faction was formed to stem the forces of Federalism.

Maclay's only genuinely successful speaking effort was on the relatively trivial question of titles. His speeches were often treated with marked disrespect by the opposition. After he had completed his speech on behalf of French commerce, the term monkey was applied to him, and Ellsworth fell on him with most sarcastic severity. It must be remembered, however, that Maclay, himself, often used studied irony and sarcasm in his own speeches. It must not be thought, however, that he was completely ineffective. The votes on many of the questions before the first Senate were very close. That on the Funding Bill, for instance, was 14 to 12.

But Maclay's modest place in the history of both Pennsylvania and American oratory is assured, regardless of his success. Strong in argument, but relatively weak in ethical and emotional appeal, he spoke in a style that was clear, forceful, elevated, and often dignified by his complete and unabashed sincerity. His is the only voice we hear speaking for Jeffersonian democracy behind the closed doors of the first Senate. His was the first voice raised in the Senate against faction and selfish interest, against increasing federal power, and for a plain, classless government by and for all the people.

FOOT NOTES:

1. The biographical data in the preceding paragraphs were obtained from Heber G. Gearhart, *The Life of William Maclay*, The Northumberland County Historical Proceedings, ii, (1930). 46-73.
2. This and the following data and quotations are from the *Journal of William Maclay*, Introduction by Charles A. Beard, New York, 1927.

Trends In Speech In The Eastern States

—Edited by: Dr. Carroll C. Arnold

The educational terrain across which this department may range is marked by few confining hedgerows, but some of the subjects which will receive special attention are:

1. The "why's" of curriculum changes.
2. The place of Speech in "general education."
3. The application of the tools of other disciplines in speech, drama, radio-TV, and allied courses.
4. Programs involving collaboration between departments and divisions of Speech and other academic divisions of schools and colleges.
5. Community service enterprises exclusive of plays and radio-TV programs.
6. New developments in specialized training.

"Trends" will also be concerned with what *could* happen as well as with what *is* happening. From time to time the department will feature a review of some of the dreams and hopes—even sternly disciplined thoughts—from which new developments in the teaching of Speech seem likely to spring one day.

But "Trends" can be only as stimulating as its readers make it. The editor of the department will be dependent upon the readers' willingness to supply him with many items of news and comment, from which he may select the most relevant as trends and special problems begin to be revealed in his correspondence with readers.

THE CURRICULUM

To recognize and integrate the offerings of any academic department is always a time-consuming and arduous task, yet even the younger Departments of Speech and Drama are beginning to find it necessary to re-examine the course programs which the inheritance of years and the period of post-war expansion have furnished them. In recognition of the pressures for reassessment of curricula, "Trends" proposes to call to notice in each issue the rationale and, the characteristics of some newly revised school or college speech program.

Our first report in this series concerns major revisions in the organization of basic courses in Speech at Queens College, Flushing, New York. Professor Wilbur E. Gilman, Chairman of the Department of Speech at Queens reports that essential features of the new curriculum include a shift to four class meetings per week for one

semester, from the previous schedule of two class meetings weekly throughout the year, and adoption of a program for assigning students to courses designed to meet their special needs. By concentrating the work of the course in a single semester, it is possible to reduce the number of sections assigned to an instructor without increasing the number of instructors and at the same time to give Speech a more prominent place in the student's program.

Instead of requiring all students to take the same basic course in Speech, Queens College now offers alternative courses to which students are assigned on the basis of need. The two courses are similar in objectives, scope and methods, but one gives greater emphasis to speech improvement and speech standards while the second stresses forms of communication, including discussion, parliamentary procedure, expository speaking, and persuasion. In either course the student receives three semester hours of credit for four weekly meetings. Group and individual conferences are scheduled for the fourth meeting.

The two standard courses at Queens are supplemented by special remedial courses to which students may be assigned on the basis of a speech interview required of all first-term freshmen. The three remedial courses (with sections limited to ten students) are: Special Problems in Speech Re-education, Speech for the Foreign Born, and Remedial Speech. A course in Voice and another in Diction are also available for those students needing such training.

Professor Gilman reports general departmental enthusiasm for the new system of courses and student referral. Other City Colleges, about to make revisions in their own basic courses in Speech, are watching with considerable interest the program which Queens College put into effect at the opening of the present academic year.

COURSE REORGANIZATION AT BROOKLYN

Brooklyn College is one of the institutions considering a reorganization of courses not unlike that just completed at Queens. Professor Orvin P. Larson, newly elected Chairman of the Department of Speech at Brooklyn, indicates that the speech faculty there believes the problems of voice and diction are generally less severe among college students than in years past. The Depart-

ment, therefore, contemplates broadening the coverage of basic courses to meet other, more pressing needs.

Another phase of curriculum study at Brooklyn is concerned with reducing the number of required courses. The Department seeks ways of strengthening its system of offerings as it brings the departmental program into conformity with a college-wide movement to expand the elective system.

FLATTERING RESULTS AT WESTMINSTER

A similar inquiry, aimed at reducing the number of required courses, at Westminster College had flattering results for the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art at that institution. After careful investigation, involving a good deal of student-faculty testimony, Westminster's Faculty Committee on Curriculum Revision concluded that the existing one-hour course in Fundamentals of Speech must become a two-hour course and that the expanded offering must remain a requirement for all freshmen. According to Professor Melvin P. Moorhouse, "The opinion prevailed in the Committee that the skill of expressing one's self effectively before a group was so important in 'general education' that a one-hour course was wholly inadequate and that to permit Speech as an elective only was to allow too many to sidestep this essential experience."

MOTION PICTURE PROGRAMS

Two new courses do not, of course, prove the existence of a trend, but Cornell University and New York State Teachers College, Oneonta, have instituted courses in the history, social significance, and art of the motion picture.

Costs and geographical location have prevented most Eastern universities and colleges from developing strong programs in motion picture acting, directing, and producing; but some institutions of higher learning and a few high schools recognize an obligation to study and interpret for their students the artistic, economic, social, and historical aspects of this great medium of dramatic representation. In a future issue, the editor of "Trends" hopes to be able to summarize these developments and he, therefore, begs all who are working in this field to report to him their achievements, problems, and hopes.

VARIETY OF ATTITUDES

The placement and administration of Speech and Dramatics in the secondary school program is another subject which "Trends" might review

if teachers of these subjects are willing to furnish the necessary information. That teachers and school systems approach this problem in various—even disparate—moods and ways is evident in the following excerpts from letters recently sent to the editor of "Trends":

James P. Kavanagh, Binghamton, N. Y., Central High School: "We observe the scholastic value of general speech and drama is placed below that of general literature by counsellors and administrators. This results in the brilliant and talented being 'ushered' into literature. . . hence, restricted achievement. Requiring school boards to maintain speech arts program under competent teachers is the great aim of the New York State Speech Association. . . We solicit help."

Milacent G. Ocvirk, Director of English, Ithaca, N. Y., Public Schools: "Since September 1948, eight one-semester courses of senior English have been taught in the Ithaca High School (World Literature, American Literature, Contemporary Dramatic Literature, Speech, Creative Writing, Journalism, Our Language, and Practical English). Proof of the interest and enthusiasm with which seniors select their English courses is that many are taking more than the required two electives and some have taken as many as five. The students have demonstrated that they value the right to choose."

Gwendoline L. Reid, Central High School, Auburn, N. Y.: "(Here) speech work is considered a part of the work of every English teacher . . . One teacher has charge of all formal speech training and dramatics coaching, though much of her time is devoted to teaching English classes."

Dorothy R. McConkey, Memorial Junior High School, Passaic, N. J.: "The now popular trend to throw everything into the lap of the classroom teacher has come to our speech work. Therefore, all the work done by the teachers of speech is corrective. Children are dismissed from the classroom in groups of five or six, once a week, for a period of twenty minutes. Previously the speech teacher went into the classroom for work in general speech improvement."

Daniel Turner, Aldrich High School, Lakewood, R. I.: "We have one English period per week devoted to Speech. I, as the speech

teacher, have a weekly schedule under which I go from English class to English class. We feel that the system is working out reasonably well."

Certainly no clear pattern for placing and administering Speech and Dramatics is to be found here. Whither we tend will doubtless be determined by the goals, the "ideal program," for which we strive and yearn. What is that program for Speech in the secondary schools? The editor of "Trends" would like to hear what replies the high school teachers make to this question so that he may deal realistically with the problem.

SERVICE TO THE SPEECH-HANDICAPPED

Trends in the expansion and organization of services for the speech-handicapped, especially in metropolitan centers, are illustrated by two important developments in the speech improvement program of the New York City Schools. One member of the Public Schools Speech Improvement Department is now assigned as speech therapist to each of the City's three centers for treatment of cerebral palsy. In a further effort to provide full-time counsel on speech improvement for those especially in need of it, the New York City Schools have recently organized two "speech centers" in elementary schools. Speech-handicapped pupils who present especially difficult cases are assigned to these centers so that they may receive daily instruction from a special, qualified teacher. At each "speech center" special classrooms and equipment are provided.

Dr. Letitia Raubicheck, Director of the Bureau for Speech Improvement, and Evelyn Konigsberg, Assistant Director, report that if results in the "speech centers" are as satisfactory as they promise to be, other centers will probably be established as further needs are revealed.

It is, of course, well known that there are few school systems in which the program for speech improvement is more firmly established or more strongly supported than in our largest city. Unfortunately, the difficulties under which remedial training in Speech is currently being extended in smaller communities are, perhaps typified in a program recently launched in Passaic, New Jersey. There, in order to serve children and adults not attending the public schools, six teachers of speech improvement of the public school system have established a free clinic in the building which houses evening, adult education classes. Dorothy McConkey of Memorial Junior High

School reports that these speech teachers make themselves available for an hour or more, one night of each week, to work with speech-handicapped children and to recommend other services to those who need assistance which the free clinic cannot provide. The Board of Education does not sponsor this service beyond providing space for the clinic.

Some up-state New York systems have, in recent years, engaged the temporary services of specialists to conduct speech surveys and to advise regular teachers concerning the handling of special cases. Illustrative is the following description provided by Gwendoline L. Reid, Head of the English Department, Central High School, Auburn, New York:

During two school years, at the request of the Board of Education, Professor Harry Heltman of Syracuse University has conducted special clinics in Central High School for children with speech defects. In each case the child's English teacher was invited to be present at the conference to gain an understanding of the child's difficulty and to learn of corrective measures that she might employ in helping the child to overcome his handicap. At the end of the day, Professor Heltman addressed the entire faculty, discussing what he had observed, explaining some of the values of clinical work, and stressing the importance of follow-up work to be carried on co-operatively by pupils and teachers. Similar programs were conducted in all the other schools of Auburn.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS

In an unusual venture the Departments of Political Science and of Speech at Queens College have completed plans for an interdepartmental concentration or major. The new program requires students to enroll for thirty-six semester credits in such courses as American Government and other American Studies, Comparative Government, International Studies, Radio and Television, Persuasive Speechmaking, Public Discussion, Cross Examination and Debate, and History and Principles of Public Address. The new course of study culminates in a Seminar in Public Affairs which meets weekly and is jointly managed by the co-operating Departments.

"SPEECH FOR THE CLASSROOM TEACHER"

At Morgan State College and at the University of Delaware, the faculties of Speech and Educa-

tion collaborate in sponsoring courses entitled, "Speech for the Classroom Teacher." At each institution the course is required of all majors in Education. Miss M. B. Hibler, Chairman for Speech and Drama at Morgan State, outlines the following objectives of that school's offering: 1) to improve the speech of the prospective teacher, 2) to demonstrate the relation of special speech forms to specific teaching purposes, and 3) to offer the prospective teacher simple techniques for helping pupils develop adequacy in speech. Concentrating upon the first of these three objectives, the University of Connecticut's School of Education now requires all entering students to take a speech examination given by members of the Department of Speech and Drama.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COURSES

Increasing inter-departmentalism is also being emphasized in still another way at The Pennsylvania State College. An inter-departmental committee appointed by the Liberal Arts Dean recommended three new courses in semantics: one to be given in Speech, another in Philosophy, and the third in English. Together these three courses, in addition to work already available, provide a stronger and broader approach to semantic studies than any one department could profitably offer. Another inter-departmental committee is at work devising a joint curriculum in radio-television, to be sponsored by the departments of Speech, Journalism, Commerce and the Division of Drama. Strictly on the graduate level, a combination of seminar and research work is now being discussed by professors representing ten different departments in three Schools of the College. This trend represents a conviction that seems certain to gain increasing support. It is accompanied by a campus-wide movement to reduce the number of courses offered by individual departments. It is expected that the net effect will be both to lower expenses and to raise the quality of instruction.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

In at least two up-state New York cities, high school and elementary school speakers were mobilized to assist in the Community Chest campaigns this year. In Auburn and Ithaca, officers of the Community Chest initiated the program in the belief that it would provide wider publicity than the traditional essay contests. School officials and teachers seized upon the occasion as one which would provide student speakers with real-

istic experience in public speaking. In Ithaca, officers of the Community Chest suggested speech subjects and organized school and city public speaking contests. Winning speakers in elementary, junior, and senior divisions received small cash prizes and were assigned to carry the Chest's appeal in public appearances on local radio stations, before service clubs, PTA meetings, and the like. Although participation in the program was voluntary in all schools, as many as forty students prepared three to five minute speeches for a single intra-school contest. The program carried out in Auburn was limited to the high schools, each of which sent student speakers to discuss the Community Chest before service club audiences. School and community leaders in both communities had high praise for the educational and civic benefits attained through their cooperative ventures.

MORGAN STATE SPEECH CHOIR

A different kind of community service is being offered by the fourteen-voice speech choir recently organized at Morgan State College. The choir has prepared special programs for three different kinds of audience. It presents such works as Langston Hughes's "African Dance," Angela Morgan's "Work," Vachel Lindsay's "The Congo," and various short ballads for college, high school, and general audiences. In order that they may add to the beauty of church services, members have prepared passages from the New Testament and from the Psalms. In order to fill an invitation from the Y. W. C. A., the group is also preparing an Easter program which will center around James Weldon Johnson's "Crucifixion."

DEBATE AND LIBERAL ARTS

"General education, therefore, will concentrate, not on the fullest possible development of the motives, attitudes, and habits that will enable the student to inform himself and think for himself throughout life. It will stress (1) the importance of being informed, of basing decisions, actions and opinions on accurate facts; (2) knowledge of where and how to acquire information; and (3) ability to appraise, relate, and integrate facts in order to form valid judgments. The habit of making this approach can best be developed by leading the student to apply it at every opportunity in his life on the campus, in solving problems inside and outside the classroom."—A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Washington, Dec. 1947, p. 52.

Significant Research In The Eastern States

-Edited by: Dr. David C. Phillips

This department will never be able to describe all research work being done in Speech in the East, but will try to be reasonably representative. The co-operation of all who are interested is urged in sending in notes on pertinent research projects.

Edwin B. Black of Cornell just completed a study of the transcripts of group discussions, concentrating on passages in which orderly group thinking seemed to break down. Chief among the things which the study suggested are: (1) a sudden descent to the specific without a corresponding return to the level of abstraction at which the discussion had been progressing seems to be a feature of many, if not all, digressions; and (2) one of the causes of ambiguity which is seldom discussed but which was frequently present in these breakdowns, is failure by a speaker to make clear to all what values lie behind the enthymemes he uses in informal discussion. The study is by no means definitive; but if the qualities Black identified are truly characteristic of the kind of talk which makes discussion digressive or ambiguous, teachers of Speech would be well advised to qualify their injunctions to use specific examples and to warn their students against using enthymematic or deductive chains of reasoning without first making certain that listeners understood and accepted the hidden schemes of value which lay behind those lines of reasoning.

Graduate students in speech, with the assistance of experimental psychologists at the University of Pittsburgh, are interested in testing and studying some of the aesthetic assumptions in theatre. An intensive review of the literature, together with discussions of possible design are the first steps toward realization of such controlled work. An example of this research is to be found in "A study of Audience Reaction to a Stereotype Character," by Buell Whitehill, Jr. and Francis Kodman, Jr. in *Educational Theatre Journal*, IV (May, 1952), 139-42. While speaking of the University of Pittsburgh, the Seventh Annual Conference on Current Trends in Psychology took place at that institution on February 20 and 21. The conference was devoted to Information Theory and among the sessions of interest to those in the speech field were: (1) "Information Theory and the Study of Speech" conducted by George A. Miller, Associate Professor of Psy-

chology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and (2) "Communications in Clinical Psychiatry" conducted by Henry W. Brosin, Director, Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, and Chairman, Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. J. Donald Harris, Director of the Research in the Sound Branch of the U. S. Navy Medical Research Laboratory, USN Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, reports this interesting information:

1. "Sonarman Selection. Research is underway to determine the particular auditory or other qualifications a man must possess to perform certain special listening duties. This work involves among other things a factor analysis of fundamental auditory abilities.
2. "Audiology. Research is underway on the best methods for assessing threshold acuity for pure tones, noise and speech by air conduction and by bone conduction. The relation between hearing for speech and hearing for pure tones is receiving especial care. The relation between intelligibility of uninterrupted speech and the alpha rhythm in the electroencephalograph is being looked into. The relation between forced stammering produced in the laboratory and "natural" stammering is being investigated with the "visible speech" technique.
3. "Psychoacoustics. The fundamental discriminatory powers of the normal ear are being investigated for intensity and frequency. Research is underway to re-define the pitch scale and the loudness scale. The after-effects of pure tone stimulation, both of a very mild and very intense nature are being investigated.

4. "The Bioacoustic Section. Research is under way in the physiology, bio-chemistry, and neurology of the auditory system. The utilization of blood gasses and food stuffs by the cochlea is being looked into, the activity of single fibers in the auditory nerve is being investigated, and the cochlea is being looked at with micro-manipulation techniques."

Dr. Alvin M. Liberman, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Connecticut reports on the work of his associates and himself: "A group

at the Haskins Laboratories in New York City has been investigating the perception of speech by making controlled modifications in spectrographic patterns and then, with an appropriate playback instrument, converting the spectrograms into sound to determine the effects of the experimental changes on the sound as heard. This method makes it possible to take advantage of the spectrograms, not merely as a highly appropriate way of displaying speech for descriptive purposes, but also as a flexible and convenient means of experimentally controlling or, in the extreme case, synthesizing speech-like sounds; it appears to be especially useful for dealing with the dynamic or constantly varying aspects of the acoustic patterns."

"Using highly schematic, hand-painted spectrograms, the Haskins group has attempted to determine (1) the effects of variations in the frequency position of the explosive burst on the perception of the unvoiced stops, (2) the effects of variations in the consonant-vowel transitions (frequency shifts in the "vowel" formants in the region where consonant and vowel join) on the perception of the voiced- and unvoiced- stop and nasal consonants, (3) the formants frequency positions that are most effective in producing synthetic, two-formant approximations to the cardinal vowels, and (4), in somewhat preliminary fashion, the role of rate of frequency shift in the perceptual identification of various speech sounds."

The methods and some of the results so far obtained are described in the following papers:

F. S. Cooper, Spectrum analysis. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 1950, 22, 761-762.

F. S. Cooper, A. M. Liberman, and J. M. Borst. The interconversion of audible and visible patterns as a basis for research in the perception of speech. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 1951, 37, 318-325.

P. C. Delattre, A. M. Liberman, and F. S. Cooper. Voyelles synthétiques à deux formantes et voyelles cardinales. *LeMaitre Phonétique*, No. 96, 1951, 30-36.

A. M. Liberman, P. C. Delattre, and F. S. Cooper, The role of selected stimulus variables in the perception of the unvoiced stop consonants. *American Journal of Psychology*, 1952, 65, 497-516.

F. S. Cooper, P. C. Delattre, A. M. Liberman, J. M. Borst, and L. J. Gerstman. Some experiments on the perception of synthetic speech sounds. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 1952, 24, 597-606.

P. C. Delattre, A. M. Liberman, F. S. Cooper, and L. J. Gerstman. An experimental study of the acoustic determinants of vowel color; observations on one- and two-formant vowels synthesized from spectrographic patterns. *Word*, (in press).

Dr. Oliver Bloodstein of Brooklyn College reports on many research studies on stuttering being carried on at Brooklyn. A study by Dr. Bloodstein,

William Jaeger and Jack Tureen entitled "A Study of the Diagnosis of Stuttering by Parents of Stutterers and Non-Stutterers" was reported in *The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, XVII, No. 3 (September, 1952) 308-15, and includes the following as summary:

"As a partial test of Johnson's 'diagnosogenic' theory of stuttering, 24 parents of young stutterers and 24 parents of young non-stutterers were asked to diagnose as 'stuttering' or 'normal' the recorded spontaneous speech of six stuttering and six non-stuttering children. The following were the essential findings:

1. Parents of stutterers significantly exceed parents of non-stutterers in the extent to which they diagnosed both the stuttering and non-stuttering children as stutterers.

2. Among parents of stutterers as well as among parents of non-stutterers, mothers and fathers as groups did not differ significantly in the number of diagnoses of stuttering which they made.

3. There was a tendency for married couples to score somewhat alike, especially among parents of non-stutterers.

The results are consistent with a 'diagnosogenic' theory of stuttering. In view of the findings, the usefulness of the term 'primary stuttering' appears open to some doubt. Assuming that penalty for speech interruptions is instrumental in the development of stuttering, parental standards of fluency would seem to play a definite part in its onset."

Dr. Bloodstein also reports, "Stemming from the above study and now nearing completion, is a new project being done by Flora Meltzer, Speech Clinician in the Brooklyn College Community Speech and Hearing Center, and myself. We are trying to construct and standardize a Test of Parental Tolerance for Childhood Nonfluency. In its present form the test consists of tape recording of a series of 34 fifteen-second samples of the speech of normal young children. The parent of a stuttering youngster is asked to respond to each speech sample by making a judgment of "stutterer" or "non-stutterer." The number of diagnoses of "stutterer" which she makes serves as a measure of her reaction to normal childhood speech hesitations. In clinical work this score is used as a guide in determining whether to direct our efforts largely toward lowering a parent's standards of fluency or largely toward reducing

her child's speech repetitions. Because of the controversial assumptions on which this test is based, scores must be interpreted very cautiously in clinical work. At present the test may be used more confidently as a research instrument. It is hoped that some information about the familial tendency in stuttering may be obtained by administering the test to groups of adult stutterers and to normal speakers with a familial background of stuttering. Ultimately we hope to administer the test to a large number of parents *before* their children have learned to speak. In this way the theory of Wendell Johnson that parents' high standards of fluency tend to cause stuttering may be tested fairly conclusively by examining the children after an interval of several years."

In the investigation by Dr. Carl Wilson at Penn State entitled "An Experimental Study of Selected Correlates of Emergent Leadership During Problem Solving Discussion," 135 college public-speaking students were divided, on the basis of equated differences of opinion on the topic, into 32 chairless groups of four and five persons. For 45 minutes they followed a group problem-

solving sequence in discussing "How Should World Peace Be Sought?"

Scores on emergent leadership and on 33 variables were derived from group members' rankings and ratings of group members. Leadership scores were normally distributed and were associated with scores on the variable, Autocratic Behavior, at almost the .05 level. Students recognized significantly to whom they were granting leadership; scores on Estimated Exerted Influence were associated with Criterion Scores at the .01 level. The transferability of leadership potential was verified.

Seven functional variables were correlated with emergent autocratic leadership at the .05 level or better. They were (1) participation, (2) ideas considered worthwhile by group members, (3) appropriate speech habits, (4) the assumption of chairmanship functions, (5) the stating of a superior goal, (6) superior approved solutions, and (7) being liked as discussion participants. The correlations, though significant, were low and accounted for only a fraction of the total leadership. Measures of the ability to state standards for judging goals and goal-paths were not significantly related to emergent autocratic leadership.

Potomac Fever

According to the "Congressional Directory," there are 1,087 reporters "covering" Washington. To help them, the Government hires 2,625 full-time press agents and 1,007 part-time people on public relations—more than three Government spokesmen for each reporter.

The figures on official press agents became public at the insistence of Congressmen who have been trying to find out how much the Government spends publicizing itself. The answer: Salaries and other "personal services" for publicity costs \$17,134,390 a year.

The Air Force lists 741 people on its publicity staff. The Navy has 642 and the Army 90. The Economic Stabilization Agency (controls) reported 411 and the Mutual Security Agency (aid for U. S. Allies) 209.

Are we taking full advantage of the interrelationships among the different branches and specialties of our own profession?

Do we have a Plato, an Isocrates, an Aristotle, a Cicero, a Quintilian in our midst? Each of them was constitutionally incapable of merely transmitting tradition.

Today's Speech Books In Review

—Edited by: Professor Arthur Eisenstadt

Just as "Today's Speech" is a departure from the traditional speech journal, this department also leaves the conventional to review briefly some of the more recent publications in essay rather than unit form. For future issues, guest specialists who will write on outstanding texts in their own speech area, and critical reviews of books which have contributed to the development of significant concepts—speech as a tool of democracy, and the growing role of listening in the speech field, for example—are projected. But now, with a hello! as cordial as it is brief, let's proceed to the late '52-early '53 literary output.

The field of public address has been enriched—or enlarged, if you take the cautious view — by a number of published studies and texts in the recent past. Conspicuous among these is *How To Talk With People* by Irving J. Lee of Northwestern University. Subtitled, "A Program for Preventing Troubles That Come When People Talk Together", it treats some of the problems of group discussion in the adult workaday situation. A feeling that ". . . people need the art of human communion with each other" prompted a study of ". . . staff, board and committee meetings in private businesses, military organizations, and community agencies." Chronicled in disarmingly lucid prose are group situation frictions and suggested improvements. Descriptive chapter headings are: They Talk Past Each Other, The Problem of the Partisan, On Preserving Human Warmth, and The Image of Men Talking Together. The book is an affable and penetrating blend of psychology, semantics, first-hand experience and first-rate intelligence.

Further highlighting the importance of discussional skills is the appearance of two texts which also center around group talk. The first is Joseph F. O'Brien's *Parliamentary Law for the Layman*, a readable and extensive account of parliamentary law and strategy. Included are chapters on the parliamentary system and its role in modern social and business patterns, on forming organizations and holding elections, and on the Legal Rights and Responsibilities of Lay and Church Organizations. The second is *Everyday Business Speech* by Huston and Sandberg, which is "Built around the most common business speech situation, the conference. . ." Approximately half the text concerns itself with Elements of Conference Speaking, Ex-

position and Persuasion in Conference Speaking, Policy and Sales Conferences, and The Application Interview. A reminder of Quintilian's "good man" is found in the authors' use of an imaginary ideal person, called the "able man", who is used as a guide and model for the personal and intellectual growth of the student.

A widely useful collection of addresses, edited by Harold F. Harding, entitled *The Age of Danger* includes Adenauer, Toynbee, Einstein, Stalin, Conant, Reuther, Urey and LaFarge among the speakers and atomic problems, politics, science, labor, education, and morals (the proximity of the last two is happenstance) among its subjects. Its potential uses for speeches, discussions, debates and meetings are obviously legion; its quality and scope excellent.

In the field of speech correction, two publications have appeared which in calibre and scope really deserve the overused accolade, "an important contribution". One, *Diagnostic Manual in Speech Correction*, was written by Johnson, Darley and Spriesterbach, all of the same school, which poses the question of latitude. The authors enjoy high professional standing and have presented material on phonation, articulation, language development, tonal deficiencies and rhythm disturbances in truly brilliant fashion. Appendices on ratings, case summaries, daily logs and drill materials round out the text.

The second major work is *A Case Book In Speech Therapy*, by Charles Van Riper. Here, a crisp and challenging approach is made. It presents a typical problem case of a speech defective with emotional involvement and requires the student to work out and present plans for examination, diagnosis and therapeutic program. This procedure should encourage initiative, familiarity with symptomatology, and a pragmatic grasp of the specifics of speech correction. Assertedly one of the first texts designed to meet the new certification standards of the Speech and Hearing Association, it appears to have much to recommend it.

Several more varied offerings have also appeared. C. Raymond Van Dusen has prepared a second edition of his voice and diction text, *Training The Voice For Speech*. Careful treatment is given to ear training and physical preparation before self-improvement, while the

closing chapters treat review, application, and suggestions to teachers, all of which bespeak sound educational orientation. Gottlober's *Understanding Stuttering* —an optimistic title — reflects the bio-psychological school of thought. Psychotherapy, group therapy and the familiar relaxation therapy are described in some detail. It is well worth perusal. In the field of books for adult self-improvement and exam preparation, Lillian Haut's *Speak Correctly* ranks well. Treated are typical mispronunciations, common voice errors, and misplaced stress. Much practice material is included, both graded and helpful.

Teachers of dramatics should know that a revised and enlarged *Producing the Play*, by John Gassner is now off the press. Material on television and a chapter on drama for industry have been added, and the combination of the esthetic and the practical - artist and artisan, so to speak — has been refreshed and re-presented. "The New Scene Technician's Handbook", a separate section, closes this remarkably comprehensive, though necessarily non-intensive, text.

An interesting commonality of philosophy may be found in two new books on oral interpretation: Gail Boardman's *Oral Communication of Literature* and Charlotte I. Lee's *Oral Interpretation*. The former writes of ". . . the twin arts of literature and interpretation", and the latter observes that ". . . the person who reads aloud is . . . interpreting one art through the medium of another." Both, in short, endorse that same root notion which turned the "art" of Elocution into the study of Public Address; that to say something well, one should have understanding and respect for what is being said. Professor Lee presents separately the treatment of prose, of drama, and of poetry, and appends a brief history of theories of interpretation. Professor Boardman prefers to

group her material by method rather than by situation: gaining impressions, planning, communicating, and specialized fields of interpretation. Each opens with an overview, and each presents the distillate of years of competent, successful teaching. As this reviewer sees them, both offer much that is sound, attractive and useful.

Certain other books, because of their late receipt and press commitments, will be deferred to the next issue. These include George Miller's *Language and Communication*, Brembeck and Howell on *Persuasion*, Heffner's revised *General Phonetics* and a well-annotated, remarkably inclusive bibliography of literature on the handicapped by Helga Lende of the American Foundation for the Blind. And now, to amend Chaucer's phrase, "here endeth the firste reviewe."

Books Reviewed:

- Boardman, Gail, *Oral Communication of Literature*, 1953, N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, pp. 472, \$4.95.
- Gassner, John, *Producing The Play*, (rev. ed.), 1953, N. Y.: Dryden Press, pp. 915, \$5.75.
- Gottlober, A. B., *Understanding Stuttering*, 1952, N. Y.: Grune and Stratton, pp. 288, \$5.50.
- Harding, H. F., *The Age of Danger*, 1952, N. Y.: Random House, pp. 561, \$3.25.
- Haut, Lillian, *Speak Correctly*, 1952, N. Y.: Speech Handbooks, pp. 56, \$1.50.
- Huston, A. D., and Sandberg, R. A., *Everyday Business Speech*, 1952, N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, pp. 302, \$4.00.
- Johnson, W., et al, *Diagnostic Manual In Speech Correction*, 1953, N. Y.: Harper, pp. 221, \$2.50.
- Lee, C. I., *Oral Interpretation*, 1952, N. Y.: Houghton-Mifflin, pp. 596, \$3.50.
- Lee, I. J., *How To Talk With People*, 1952, N. Y.: Harper, pp. 176, \$2.00.
- O'Brien, J. F., *Parliamentary Law for The Layman*, 1952, N. Y.: Harper, pp. 248, \$3.00.
- Van Dusen, C. R., *Training The Voice For Speech*, sec. ed., 1952, N. Y.: McGraw Hill, pp. 232, \$3.50.
- Van Riper, C., *A Case Book In Speech Therapy*, 1953, N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, pp. 144, \$2.75.

SPONSORS

(As of March 25, 1953)

Carroll C. Arnold, *Cornell University*
Marvin G. Bauer, *Brooklyn College*
J. Calvin Callaghan, *Syracuse University*
Martin T. Cobin, *West Virginia University*
Jon Eisenson, *Queens College*
Arthur Eisenstadt, *Newark College
of Rutgers University*
Jean C. Ervin, *University of Connecticut*
Deanne T. Finne, *City College of New York*
Mary B. Hennessey, *Waterbury Public Schools*
James H. Henning, *West Virginia University*
Gordon F. Hostettler, *Temple University*

Harriett Nesbitt, *The Pennsylvania State College*
Robert P. Newman, *University of Pittsburgh*
New York Speech Association
Robert T. Oliver, *The Pennsylvania State College*
Lindsey S. Perkins, *Brooklyn College*
David C. Phillips, *University of Connecticut*
Richard C. Reager, *Rutgers University*
J. Walter Reeves, *Peddie School*
Ota Thomas Reynolds, *Hunter College*
Clayton H. Schug, *The Pennsylvania State College*
Ralph N. Schmidt, *Utica College
of Syracuse University*
Nadine Shephardson, *Mt. Holyoke College*

OUR AUTHORS

While one cannot possibly refer to Madge Kramer (Ph. D., Columbia, '36) as "an old-timer," it was because of her long service in the Eastern Association that she was asked to prepare for the Boston Convention, in the Spring of 1950, a paper on its history. Albeit space required some cutting, we deem it particularly fitting to launch our magazine with her witty and suggestive gleanings from the labors of our forebears.

Giles Wilkinson Gray (Ph. D., Iowa, '26) has one of the most extensive bibliographical files ever assembled on Speech. Hence it was no surprise to find that he also has a file of *The Public Speaking Review*. What he says about it increases our respect both for that early fore-runner of all Speech journals and for the author. He reminds us, through his stimulating summary, of how high a standard we must set if our present magazine is to be worthy of its antecedent.

When we asked Robert Haakenson (Ph. D., Iowa, '52 to write a summary of present conditions in radio and television which would fill in some of the gaps of ignorance of the editor, this did not seem an inordinately arduous assignment. But his generous fulfillment of the request may, we hope, enlarge the knowledge of many a reader.

Merrill G. Christopherson (M. A., Northwestern) may or may not have intended his comments on teaching Speech to the military to suggest improvements in teaching Speech on all levels and in all types of classrooms. But so many who heard him present this paper at the Cincinnati Convention 'found it stimulating that we hastily cornered him and secured "first publication rights".

As a long-time student of propaganda, Ross Scanlan (Ph. D. Cornell, '37) thinks it is high time we in the democracies awoke to the full potentialities of the "Cold War" weapon our enemies use so well. Henry Youngerman (Ph. D., Wisconsin, '40) agrees with him and points out we do teach more propaganda techniques than we realize in our Speech classes. Both these papers were presented, in somewhat altered form, at Cincinnati.

James M. Lewis (M. A., Ohio State) sees positive humane and liberal values in group discussion. Frank Merritt (Ph. D. Cornell, '51) invites attention to an early democrat and to problems of government somewhat less dangerous but hardly less provocative than those that agitate us today.

The permanent departments of *Today's Speech* are conducted by Carroll Arnold (Ph. D. Iowa, '42), David Phillips (Ph. D. Wisconsin, '47) and Arthur Eisenstadt (M. A., Brooklyn, '46) — all of whom solicit assistance from our readers and promise as much breadth of scope as such cooperation permits. As for the depth, we know what they can provide and we rejoice in the prospect.

These are "our authors" for this first issue. For the issues to come we hope that all areas—theatre, speech therapy, oral interpretation, adult speech, and the rest—will be well represented by seasoned scholars, peppery new-comers and non-professional practitioners and critics of Speech. Be right and fear no man; do write, and help us produce a lively journal of value to all who speak, who teach Speech, or who listen and appraise.

THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH

**The Pennsylvania
State College**

Offers courses leading to the degrees of B.A., B.S., M.A., M.S., M.Ed., Ph.D. or Ed.D., with courses and research in the following areas:

SPEECH COMMUNICATION

DISCUSSION

INTERPRETATION

RADIO AND TELEVISION

SPEECH AND HEARING CLINIC

GENERAL SEMANTICS

SPEECH IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

SPEECH EDUCATION

PUBLIC ADDRESS

SPEECH SCIENCE

For information concerning courses, requirements and assistantships, please write to

ROBERT T. OLIVER

Head, Department of Speech

The Pennsylvania State College

State College, Pennsylvania

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

department of

**Speech and
Dramatic
Arts**

*Graduate and Undergraduate
programs in*

Public Address
Speech Education
Radio and Television
Speech Correction
Audiology
Theater

Speech and Hearing Clinic

University Theatre
Forensics Program

WRTI-FM
Workshops

Graduate Assistantships Available

ADDRESS:

Dr. Gordon F. Hostettler, Chm.
Department of Speech & Dramatic Arts

Temple University
PHILADELPHIA 22, PA.